



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2023

No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. SPARTZ).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 29, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VICTORIA SPARTZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

A FEW REMARKABLE WOMEN FROM OREGON'S SIXTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. SALINAS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SALINAS. Madam Speaker, as Women's History Month comes to a close, I rise to recognize a few of the remarkable women who call Oregon's Sixth District home.

This month my office accepted submissions of inspiring women from across our community. While we couldn't possibly feature all of them, the women you see here today represent

some of the best Oregon has to offer.

Every day, women hold the weight of the world on their shoulders. Take Lori Simpson, for example. Lori has worked at a nonprofit for 20 years, giving back to vulnerable members of our society throughout her career. Outside work, she is laser-focused on building a happy home for her two boys, especially after she was tragically widowed when her youngest was just 11. She is unstoppable and loved by all who know her.

The same can be said for Estela Anaya, another remarkable woman from Oregon's Sixth. Twenty years ago, Estela left her home and her family in Mexico in hopes of providing her five children with opportunities she could only dream of. Estela struggled to learn English, but never to care for her children. She showed up to every meeting, concert, and game because for her, family comes first.

Family is the foundation of life for so many women in our community, but that doesn't limit them from doing more because the women of Oregon's Sixth District can do it all.

Just look at Kristen Stoller. When she is not being a devoted mom to three beautiful children or running her successful business, she is working to make Yamhill County stronger and safer as a volunteer, board member, and nonprofit leader.

Then there is Remy Drabkin, a community organizer and elected official who is currently serving as the mayor of McMinnville. Outside her duties, Remy doubles as an entrepreneur and small business owner. Her incredible winery is now a staple in Willamette Valley.

Of course, we can't leave out Valerie Castillo, who is described by those who know her as "in every way an everywoman." Valerie works with food banks, donates blood, hosts exchange students, and has been a union steward for years.

Women like Kristen, Remy, and Valerie are a reminder that "Everything Everywhere All At Once" is more than just a best picture recipient; it is a way of life.

The next few women I want to mention have a shared gift for turning adversity into purpose.

Vivian Ang is one of those women. When she was younger, Vivian failed third grade because she struggled to read, but she didn't let that stop her. No. She turned that experience into a force for good, and now she runs a literacy organization that has tutored thousands of adults and helped hundreds gain citizenship.

Vivian's story reminds me a bit of Donna Lepley's story. Donna struggled with alcoholism for 40 years before she found the strength and support to embrace recovery. When she was 57, she went back to school, eventually earning her master's in psychology and addiction counseling. Donna now works to help people struggling with addiction and is living proof that recovery is possible.

Of course, when we are talking about turning adversity into purpose, we need to talk about Caitlin Sticka. Caitlin is a two-time breast cancer survivor who founded a group to provide support and resources for families who are impacted by this awful disease. She makes people feel welcome and safe during what can be a frightening, isolating experience, and she is changing lives, one survivor at a time.

Like Vivian, Donna, and Caitlin, Erica Jauregui also faces challenges. She was homeless as a teen but turned that into a plan to serve Oregonians at the Department of Human Services. Today, she is someone who fights hard for unhoused communities and other vulnerable individuals, and she has made a big difference in our community.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to tell you about Namene James Rodgers. Namene is a diversity, equity, and

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1531

inclusion specialist whose mission is to ensure that her organization is as inclusive and compassionate as possible. She embodies the quality that unites all of these women, a shared desire to build a better future for all.

Lori, Estela, Kristen, Remy, Valerie, Vivian, Donna, Caitlin, Erica, and Namene, you enrich our community beyond measure. Never doubt your impact because we all feel it every single day.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO REDUCE CRIME AND ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about important legislation I am introducing today. It is called the Cell Phone Jamming Reform Act. Senator TOM COTTON is introducing the companion bill in the Senate.

All around the Nation, one of the most important issues that I hear about is the rapid rise in crime, especially violent crime.

According to the Major Cities Chiefs Association Crime Report for 2022 for urban areas, homicide is up 13 percent, rape is up 23 percent, aggravated assault is up 33 percent—all since 2020.

Every one of us knows that this is unacceptable and everyone should feel safe being in their community. In the House Republicans' Commitment to America, we promised that the new Republican majority will work toward creating a Nation that is safe. A key pillar of that promise is alleviating this current crime crisis.

The Cell Phone Jamming Reform Act is a crucial first step in our effort to reduce crime and enhance public safety. This legislation will prevent criminals from conducting criminal operations from behind bars by allowing State and Federal prison officials to use cell phone jamming systems.

The technology will protect inmates, it will protect guards, and it will protect the public at large.

State attorneys general from across the country have determined that cell phones from within prisons, these contraband cell phones, are among the most serious threat to public safety facing prison administrators today.

Now, as cell phone technology has evolved, and it continues to evolve, mobile phones are easier to conceal than ever. They provide countless ways for criminals to communicate with the outside world.

Inmates use contraband cell phones to organize murders, riots, drug operations, fraud, extortion, and other crimes. I want to give you just a few examples.

In Tennessee, an inmate used a contraband cell phone to orchestrate drug conspiracy deals by shipping a package full of methamphetamine to his girlfriend from within the prison. In

South Carolina, there have been four major drug trafficking cases where the operation was run by contraband cell phones from behind prison walls. In 2018, gang-affiliated inmates in a maximum security prison used cell phones to organize and coordinate a brutal attack that killed 7 inmates and injured 20.

All Americans have the right to feel safe in their communities, to walk their kids around the block without the fear of assault, to park their car without the fear it will be broken into, or maybe taken completely.

One of the most fundamental duties of government is to ensure that its citizens have the right and the ability to live, to work, and to raise a family without the fear of being a victim of crime.

The Cell Phone Jamming Reform Act is a key step toward reducing crime, enhancing public safety, and, ultimately, to fulfilling our goal to create a Nation that is safe.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

TRANS DAY OF VISIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, ahead of Trans Day of Visibility, I rise in honor of a community that is being forced to fight for its very existence. I rise in honor of trans voices that deserve to be heard, not silenced and not criminalized. I rise in honor of trans joy that deserves to be celebrated, not eradicated. I rise with unconditional love for my trans daughter, Riley. I rise in solidarity with every trans American seeking nothing less than their inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness.

To stand in the way of that right is to stand against our most basic American values, but that is exactly what MAGA extremists are doing across this country—on school boards, in State capitals, and here in the Halls of Congress.

Elected officials are using their power to undermine the freedoms and human dignity of trans Americans, and they are waging an especially vicious crusade on our kids.

These attacks make me all the more grateful for the unconditional love that Mimi and Joe Lemay of Massachusetts have for their son, Jacob. Mimi and Joe have faced vitriol and cruelty from rightwing extremists, all because they heard, accepted, and embraced Jacob when he told them he is a boy.

A few years ago, Mimi shared a letter she wrote to her son, and I would like to offer a few of her moving words: "You have at the age of 9 years accomplished what many adults couldn't in a lifetime. In your courageous visibility, you have changed the course of your own history. You have turned strangers into allies and allies into advocates.

Layered in my pride is my concern for you. I know your strength, but I also know how determined the forces are that have pitted themselves against you. The politicians and preachers who would rather see you languish in a dark closet than watch you engage the world as you do, cultivating joy and love wherever you go."

Madam Speaker, Jacob's courage demonstrates a profound strength. Let's show that strength the respect it demands. Let's reject the forces of opposition and bigotry. Let's celebrate the bravery and beauty of our trans community. Let's follow Jacob's example and cultivate joy and love wherever we go.

HONORING LAUREN ZIEGLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I am here today to share a bittersweet message. Over 6 years ago, I interviewed Ms. Lauren Ziegler for the job of legislative assistant. I saw something rare and special in Lauren, and she proved it from her very first day on the job.

As my colleagues will attest, Capitol Hill is overflowing with many talented people, but few possess the ability to do it all and to do it well and to do it with a smile, and that sums up Lauren Ziegler.

Lauren rose from a junior L.A. position to become our legislative director and our deputy chief of staff. However, for me, her most significant role has been as one of my most trusted advisers. In truth, I can think of no one who has better advised me over the years.

From day one, Lauren understood that our number one mission was to serve the needs and the interests of the good people of the Texas 36th Congressional District. I have received countless compliments from folks in Texas and here in Washington regarding the quality of her work. Frankly, I am shocked that no other office stole Lauren away from us. I am sure many have tried.

□ 1015

Lauren's loyalty was true to the Babin team. She has served us and Texas' 36th District with all of her heart. For that, we are very grateful.

Lauren's heart belongs to the Sunshine State. She will be returning home to Florida soon to continue serving our Nation in a different capacity at NASA's Kennedy Space Center.

I have no doubt that, at NASA, Lauren Ziegler's rare and special qualities will contribute to their abilities to break barriers, explore the unknown, and send mankind back to the Moon and to places that we have never been before. I look forward to watching her future unfold down in Florida.

I hope that Lauren will look back on her time here in Washington with as much fondness for us as we have for her.

Lauren, you will always be part of Team Babin and an honorary member of the Babin family. I am very proud of you, and I am very proud to have been part of your history. Thank you for a job well done.

God bless.

THIRTEEN SCHOOL SHOOTINGS IN FIRST 3 MONTHS OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart and a level of anger shared by millions of Americans, millions of parents.

On Monday, three 9-year-old children and three adults were gunned down at the Covenant School in Nashville, Tennessee. The shooter, armed with not one but two assault weapons, broke into the school and stole the lives of innocent people simply going about their day.

For my colleagues across the aisle not keeping track, the massacre was the 130th mass shooting of the year. It was the 13th school shooting of 2023, and that is only if you count the time someone was injured or killed when a gun went off on school grounds.

Thirteen times over the past 3 months, parents have dropped their children at the bus stop or at school. They told them they loved them, to have a great day, and that they would see them when they got home. Then, they got the call that every parent fears, the one that wakes us up in the middle of the night.

Thirteen times this year, parents in a city or town hung up that phone or turned off their TV and raced to their children's school.

Thirteen times parents waited behind police tape, hoping to hear something about their son or daughter.

Madam Speaker, how many more times are we going to let this happen?

How many more times can my colleagues across the aisle tweet their thoughts and prayers but say that their hands are tied on gun safety legislation?

How many more Christmas cards of Members of Congress holding AR-15s do we need to see while students in their classrooms practice active shooter drills?

School shooting after school shooting, Congress has had the opportunity to act.

We have the legislation to ban assault weapons, like the rifles used in Nashville on Monday.

We have legislation to require background checks on every gun purchase so firearms aren't falling into the hands of people who shouldn't have them.

We have legislation to prevent someone convicted of a hate crime from being able to purchase a gun.

What this Chamber doesn't have enough of is willpower. It doesn't have

enough courage to act. This inaction is shameful, and as a parent, it is disgusting.

Apparently, the Republican leadership in the House thinks that the biggest issue facing our children today is the books in their library because while we have yet to take up a bill to stop school shootings, the number one killer of our children in America, this Chamber passed a bill last week to politicize our kids' education—a bill, by the way, that they didn't even have unanimous Republican support for.

I mean, what are we doing here?

I have to go home tomorrow and look my 8-year-old daughter in her eyes, 1 week before she turns 9, and tell her that three more kids were shot and killed in their classroom, but mama can't get half of her colleagues in the Congress to care enough to do anything about it.

How can anyone in this Chamber be okay with telling their kids or their grandkids that?

How can you see the kids who are taking pictures right outside on the Capitol steps and do nothing to prevent their school from being next?

How can we call ourselves the greatest country in the world when its elected leaders sit on their hands while children are murdered hiding beneath their desks?

We can't, and to those of you deflecting or giving up, you should be ashamed.

Madam Speaker, I implore you to go back to your party's leadership, go back to Speaker MCCARTHY and tell him that we need to end the gun violence epidemic that is plaguing our children. Do it before it is too late for another school, for another family.

GRIEVING FOR TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I come to the House floor today with a heavy and grieving heart for my home State of Tennessee. No one should ever have to endure what the Covenant School community has gone through.

I know that my colleagues here today understand how difficult the situation is, and your prayers for our community are deeply appreciated as we mourn this senseless loss of life.

I want to take a moment to remember the victims of this horrible attack: three schoolchildren, William Kinney, Evelyn Dieckhaus, Hallie Scruggs, all age 9; and three staff members, Cynthia Peak, a substitute teacher, Mike Hill, a custodian, and Covenant School Headmaster Katherine Koonce.

All the lives were precious.

Mike Hill, for example, worked for the Covenant School for 15 years. He not only served the school and the church, but he learned every student's name. He was the father of seven children.

Cynthia Peak was a beloved wife and mother.

Dr. Katherine Koonce was a dedicated and passionate educator, who always put children first.

Words cannot describe how hard it is to lose children, three precious 9-year-old children, one of whom was the daughter of the lead pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church. These children never had a chance to grow up, and my heart is completely broken for these families. I cannot imagine.

Nothing can be said to dull the pain of this tragedy. Tennesseans, and Americans worldwide, are praying and grieving with this Covenant community.

Madam Speaker, I also commend all the first responders that were on the scene and the medical professionals that treated victims at Vanderbilt Medical Center.

I especially commend the five Metro Nashville Police officers who arrived at the school first. These men ran toward the sound of the gunfire instead of away from it. Their bravery absolutely saved lives.

The two officers that shot and killed, with a gun, the shooter, Officers Rex Engelbert and Michael Collazo, are heroes. They did not hesitate, and because of their quick response, lives were saved.

Though unspeakable grief holds Nashville in its grasp, I honor the incredible heroism of Metro Nashville's first responders. Instinct and courage took over in the face of evil and fear. I join Tennesseans in expressing my sincere gratitude for their quick response.

The outpouring of love means the world to the Covenant community and all Tennesseans.

WE ARE FAILING OUR YOUTH, AND THEY KNOW IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, we are failing our youth, and they know it.

I rise today to share the voices of our children, the voices of those who attend schools where, once again this week, young lives were lost to gun violence that Congress refuses to prevent.

My office runs a Congressional Youth Cabinet, a nonpartisan program that gives high school students the opportunity to learn about our government and share their views. We meet every couple of months during the school year, and they select topics for discussion at each meeting.

Last weekend, the topic was gun violence. The next day, six people were slaughtered in yet another school shooting. Three of them were only 9 years old.

As I struggled to find words to convey, once again, the urgency that Congress act, I turned to the students in my youth cabinet. I asked them what

they would say if they had the opportunity to address Congress. Here are their voices, the voices of America's youth.

Claire: "It is terrifying to see another school shooting on the news, and even scarier that this is an almost normal thing. As students, we just want to be safe to learn and grow. . . . I feel, and I have heard this from a lot of kids, I can't walk down the hall without looking for a safe place to hide in case something happens. It really messes with your head."

Zeyan: "Gun violence feels normalized and ingrained. My school had a lockdown drill today, yet afterward, we went on with our day like the need for a lockdown drill is trivial and not disturbing. I hope legislators understand how drastically gun violence can alter students' daily lives and thoughts."

Tyler: "It is really hard to stay optimistic as a young person when we see these tragedies again and again."

Lindsay: "All those kids did today was go to school on a beautiful Monday morning. But instead of making paper cutouts of Easter bunnies or painting eggs, they were shot and murdered. [That] school is a private Christian school. Prayer takes place in every single one of those classrooms, including where third graders were shot to death. Prayers did not stop our children [from being slaughtered with] guns. A lock on the door did not stop the killer from coming in. Legislators . . . can stop this."

Several observed that easy access to guns is a major driver of school shootings.

Kiona said: "These situations happen so frequently, it makes me question how easy it is to get a firearm or assault weapon in this country. We could have prevented more of these situations."

Quin: "For me, gun violence is personal. Lives like ours are on the line. On the news, time and time again, I see my own communities attacked, from the Lunar New Year Monterey Park mass shooting to the Club Q nightclub shooting. Our schools are not safe. It is clear that gun violence targets vulnerable people of color and LGBTQ+ people. . . . Guns are the leading cause of death among children and teens."

Noah: "We need to stop treating shootings like isolated events and think of them as part of a whole. It wasn't just one person with a gun today in Nashville or in Colorado Springs or in Uvalde. It was a web of corporate greed, insufficient legislation, and hatred."

Eliot: "I am a senior in high school, and I have been directly affected by four separate instances of gun violence in the past year. I was in lockdown . . . during the Highland Park shooting . . . at the same time my close friend was hiding in a church [during an active shooter situation] at a concert. . . . Our school recently lost a classmate to gun violence, and we had a lockdown because of a threat of a shooting. . . .

The lack of action is alienating my generation. We are supposed to be the 'future of our democracy.' Our experiences of gun violence are more common than instances of legislative progress. We are told we are supposed to save democracy, to save the planet, but no one is saving us, and we notice that."

This last line really sticks with me. Our kids are being asked to put our democracy and our collective future first, but their country and their Representatives in Congress are not putting them first.

It breaks my heart to hear the fear, anger, cynicism, and hopelessness in our children's voices. We are failing our youth, and they know it.

Doing nothing is unacceptable. If you don't have any solutions, then you need to get out of their way.

Our kids deserve action now.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF JONES HOOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Mr. Jones Hooks, the longest serving executive director of the Jekyll Island Authority.

Mr. Hooks' 15 years of service to the people of Jekyll Island will never be forgotten. When he became the executive director in 2008, the island was in economic trouble, with many of its facilities operating at a deficit.

To fix this problem, and many others plaguing the island, the authorities on Jekyll proposed multiple goals, such as revitalizing Jekyll's facilities, establishing a credible conservation effort, and partnering with the private sector on certain efforts the Jekyll Island Authority could not handle alone.

Mr. Hooks achieved every goal put forth by island leadership. Thanks to his efforts and leadership, Jekyll Island is a thriving community, a hallmark of conservation efforts, a tourism location enjoyed by many, and much more.

I thank Mr. Hooks, once again, for his service, and I hope he has a restful retirement.

RECOGNIZING 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BELFAST/GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Good Friday Agreement that brought an end to 30 years of conflict in Northern Ireland.

The conflict, known as The Troubles, resulted in the deaths of hundreds of people. The conflict saw families, friends, and neighbors turn on each other. It saw political discourse become replaced by violence and bloodshed.

Despite the viciousness and length of the conflict, all parties involved, with U.S. diplomatic support, managed to come to an agreement to end it.

□ 1030

Now, 25 years after the signing of the Good Friday Agreement, the Emerald

Isle remains more peaceful and more prosperous than before the historic agreement. I applaud the commitment to peace by leaders on both sides of the Irish Sea.

I also applaud the recent Windsor Framework, which managed to preserve the principles of the Good Friday Agreement while also holding true to the requirements of Brexit.

As Americans, we should look to the Good Friday Agreement as hope that despite our differences, we can come together to solve problems, and we can work together as one team to make our country great.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CHARLENE SAUNDERS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Charlene Saunders, a loving mother, wife, and educator in the Savannah community.

Charlene and her husband, Bill, moved to Savannah in 1958 to establish the athletic program at the Savannah Country Day School.

During her 31 years at Country Day, Charlene served as the head coach of girls' basketball, girls' track, and the cheerleading team, and she oversaw the PE department.

While Charlene's teams amassed winning records, she is remembered for her strong bond with her athletes and as a model of integrity, grace, spirit, and grit. In 1982, Saunders Gym was named in her honor.

Charlene and Bill Saunders were fixtures at all student events and were held in such high regard by the student body that they received two yearbook dedications and were also named the honorable homecoming king and queen.

Her legacy continues to impact generations of students. She will be dearly missed by all who knew her.

RECOGNIZING LEROY CHAPMAN, JR.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Leroy Chapman, Jr., for being named the new editor-in-chief at the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

A veteran of the Navy, he has been a journalist for 28 years, originally coming from South Carolina. Leroy currently serves as the managing editor and has been with the AJC since 2011.

Over the course of his 27-year career, he has also worked as a columnist and editorial writer, a business reporter, and a college sports reporter.

During his career, he has helped cover a number of high-profile stories, including the 2020 election results and the court cases of teachers and administrators charged in the Atlanta Public Schools cheating scandal.

Leroy will be the AJC's first Black editor-in-chief in the newspaper's 155-year history.

I congratulate Leroy on this wonderful honor. I look forward to his continued success at the Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

By the way, this comes from another Leroy.

BIG PHARMA CORPORATE GREED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, on March 1 of this year, drug manufacturer Eli Lilly announced its plan to institute a \$35 cap on out-of-pocket insulin costs. Two weeks later, Novo Nordisk announced plans to cut its insulin prices by up to 75 percent. Just 2 days after that, Sanofi announced their decision to cut the U.S. price of its most prescribed insulin by 78 percent and cap costs at \$35 for those with private insurance.

Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi make up roughly 90 percent of the insulin market in the United States, a market that for decades has been characterized by skyrocketing costs and unbelievable price gouging.

Some might say that these price-capping announcements are examples of corporate responsibility.

Let me correct the record: I say it is about damn time. I say this action is a hollow, decades-too-late example of big pharmaceutical companies attempting to shirk regulation as they face the most realistic possibility ever of being held accountable for price gouging Americans. I say it is not enough because for a century, pharmaceutical companies have been exploiting and profiting off Americans who depend on insulin and other lifesaving medications to survive.

In 1923, the inventors of insulin sold the patent for just \$1. They felt it was unethical to profit from a discovery that would save so many lives. How ironic. Since then, insulin costs have skyrocketed, jumping 500 percent in just the past decade or so, with a vial costing as much as thousands of dollars per month.

Americans represent 15 percent of the global insulin market, yet we generate almost 50 percent of the pharmaceutical industry's insulin revenue. That is not an accident. Big Pharma has for decades taken advantage of the nonexistent regulation on drug pricing in the United States to make billions in profit off insulin.

It is corporate greed, pure and simple, fueled by hundreds of millions in dark-money lobbying to intimidate Congress from reining in the industry. In 2022 alone, pharma and health product companies spent a record \$372 million lobbying against pricing regulations and Medicare negotiations. Big Pharma is well organized, well funded, and well connected. That is why last year's Inflation Reduction Act was so historic. It was the first successful attempt in decades to curtail this price gouging.

The work to lower drug prices is why I ran for office in the first place. It has been one of my very top priorities since day one in Congress, so much so that I have been called a dog with a bone when it comes to the fight to get drug prices down.

I cosponsored and voted to pass the Lower Drug Costs Now Act. I voted to

pass the Affordable Insulin Now Act to cap the cost of insulin at \$35 per month for everyone. I introduced the bipartisan Fair Drug Prices for Kids Act to lower costs for families by allowing States to purchase medication at the lowest price offered by drug manufacturers. I called on House and Senate leadership time and again to take swift legislative action to lower drug costs. I stood with my constituents affected by high insulin prices to call attention to the crisis they face. I called for Build Back Better to include a measure enabling Medicare to negotiate drug prices, and I helped pass into law the Inflation Reduction Act that finally, finally realizes so many of these priorities.

The Inflation Reduction Act capped the price of insulin at \$35 per month for Medicare beneficiaries. Now, Big Pharma sees the writing on the wall. Their decision to lower insulin costs for everyone does not come out of so-called corporate responsibility. This decision comes because corporations are afraid that Congress, now having momentum, will continue to take action to rein in their corporate greed. Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi could have, at any point in the last century, capped the price of insulin and saved many lives. They are only doing it now as part of a transparent PR campaign to stave off further congressional action regulating drug prices. They can lower costs at will, but they can also raise costs at will. That means we must act because your ability to afford lifesaving medications should not be dependent on the whims of Big Pharma's pricing decisions.

For the countless people across my district and across the country who depend on lifesaving insulin, I am telling you that I will never back down.

REMEMBERING DONALD A. STOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Donald A. Stott of Monticello, Iowa, who lost his life aboard the USS *Oklahoma* during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

His remains were only recently identified due to the significant advancements in DNA testing. Stott's family has been working to identify his remains for over a decade until the Navy called, offering DNA tests to identify the remains of 35 soldiers who were previously labeled as unrecoverable.

As of last week, Stott's remains have been returned home to Monticello where his life and military service will be celebrated with a special burial service.

Donald Stott enlisted in the Navy at age 17 and spent the early parts of his career training in Great Lakes, Illinois, before being stationed aboard the USS *Oklahoma* in June of 1940. Stott served as a Seaman First Class, car-

rying out important duties such as steering, signaling, and standing watch.

We appreciate the Stott family's patience, and we also recognize and honor their family member.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I congratulate the University of Iowa women's basketball team and Coach Bluder on making it to the Final Four. Good luck and go Hawks.

RECOGNIZING VIETNAM WAR VETERANS DAY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, today is Vietnam War Veterans Day. As a Vietnam-era veteran and having a brother who served in Vietnam, I wish to recognize and acknowledge this day and the honorable service of those who served in Vietnam.

WISHING MY DAUGHTER A HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, 33 years ago today, I was blessed with the most incredible of gifts, with the birth of our daughter, Taylor.

Happy birthday, Taylor. You are a blessing to both your father and me.

ISRAEL'S DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as President Biden recently said: The genius of Israel and America's democracy is they are both built on strong institutions, on checks and balances, and on an independent judiciary.

Israel's checks and balances, its independent judiciary, faced an attack from its own, Prime Minister Netanyahu. He tried to implement so-called reforms that would turn Israel's courts into nothing more than an enforcement tool for his policies.

By undermining the independent judiciary and disregarding the rule of law, sadly, Israel's own Prime Minister threatens the very foundation on which Israel's democracy depends.

Israel must remain a democracy that protects and lifts all of its citizens, Israeli and Palestinian. We all want to see a safe and successful Israel. To be pro-Israel means always to be pro-democracy.

I celebrate the estimated more than 600,000 Israeli protesters who knew they needed to stand up for their Nation, for their democracy, who took to the streets against the blatant disregard for institutions, checks and balances, and an independent judiciary. I applaud their bravery that made it clear they will not tolerate the undercutting of their judicial system, compromising their military readiness, and moving their country in the direction of authoritarianism.

For its future, its safety, and security, for those who love her, Israelis and Palestinians alike, Israel must not abandon that genius of democracy, just as America cannot.

HIGH HOPES FOR THE PHILLIES

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, spring has sprung, and opening day is on the horizon. Spring is meant for new beginnings.

What a run our Phillies had last season. This year, Phillies fans come to this season with, as the great Harry Kalas sings to us after every home win, "High Hopes" for our Fightin' Phils.

Madam Speaker, we have high hopes for Trea Turner, J.T. Realmuto, Aaron Nola, Zack Wheeler, Kyle Schwarber, and our world-class players being led to glory by our manager, Philly Rob; and high hopes for the return of Bryce Harper and the recovery of Rhys Hoskins from his devastating ACL injury. We wish him a full recovery.

In my hometown of Glenside, we have high hopes for our two Glenside boys, Mike and Sammy Siani. Mike was called up to the majors last season with the Cincinnati Reds, and Sammy is well on his way.

Good luck to the Glenside Siani men, and watch out for the Fightin' Phils this season. Let's play ball.

COVENANT SCHOOL SHOOTING

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, here we are again, talking about another school shooting.

When will enough be enough in this country?

How is it that we allow our schoolchildren to go to school each day with the uncertainty of their own safety?

How do we allow parents to drop children off and not be able sometimes to pick them up at the end of the school day?

At Covenant School on Monday, in Nashville, three 9-year-old babies were slaughtered and three of their teachers, or adults, were taken, as well.

□ 1045

It is a shameful number. We now in this country have had 15 mass shootings at schools. When will enough be enough?

I hear an appalling silence from the majority party in this House—an appalling silence. Call for the safety of every one of our citizens. Call for the safety of every one of our children as they go to school, that they can come home safely and not be terrorized by what is going on.

Here we are the greatest Nation on the planet, and we can't keep our children safe. Let's close the background check loophole. Let's keep guns out of the hands of violent people. Let's get weapons of war out of the hands of civilians, off our streets, and out of our schools. We are failing our children and our grandchildren—this greatest Nation on the planet.

Please stop the appalling silence. Partner with us to end gun violence in this country and to end this shameful nightmare.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF U.S. AIR FORCE FIRST LIEUTENANT THEODORE "TED" COHEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on Vietnam Veterans Day to first and foremost thank the Vietnam veterans from my district and around the country who served, but also for a very special person, First Lieutenant Theodore "Ted" Cohen, a Staten Island resident who sadly passed away this past Saturday.

Ted was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. He attended Brooklyn College where he was a member of the ROTC. Not long after the start of the Vietnam war, he served his first tour in Spain with the Strategic Air Command before flying on 26 close air support missions in Vietnam.

Upon his return to the States, Ted spent his nights working with the Daily News before spending 25 years working for Avon in international marketing. When Ted's wife fell ill, he retired early. He decided to care for her and ensure that their last 9 years together were spent traveling the world.

After his wife passed away, his passion for caring for others, especially our veterans, became his mission. Ted served as a member of the United States Island Veterans Organization, the Air Force Association, and The American Legion. He would bring food to homebound servicemen and -women. He would provide rides to and from their appointments at the VA if they were unable to drive themselves. He even went to help them complete their paperwork, which we know can sometimes be cumbersome.

Not only was Ted a constituent and a champion for our Nation's veterans, but he was a dear friend to my office, having been a vocal member of our monthly veterans' roundtable. He always contributed greatly. He had many recommendations. We worked together to improve VA access and care.

He also served on our academy nomination board for the past several years where he provided invaluable assistance and advice to our youth throughout the entire academy nominations process, and he helped us select the next generation of servicemembers.

Our office, our local veterans, and our entire community will sincerely miss Ted and his invaluable service. His willingness to give back was so appreciated by all.

Ted exemplified the very best of what it means to be an American, to put your country, to put your community, and to put others first. He answered every call to serve with honor, integrity, and distinction. We owe him an immeasurable debt of gratitude, not only for his service to our country, but for his lifelong service to our community.

Please join me in extending condolences to his family. I thank Ted for his service.

AMERICAN GUN VIOLENCE EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today heartbroken by perpetual tragedy and outraged by perpetual inaction.

On Monday, a school shooting in Nashville left three 9-year-old students and three adults dead. The next day, when asked about solutions to the American gun violence epidemic, the majority leader of the House of Representatives offered his solution: prayers.

Let's be clear, thoughts and prayers don't save a single solitary life. Yet, after more than 130 mass shootings in less than 3 months, the Republican Party has still chosen to allow our children to be murdered in their classrooms.

To be clear, this is a choice. After every mass shooting, Republicans choose to offer empty thoughts and prayers instead of commonsense solutions, and then they turn around and cash their NRA checks.

I have spent my entire career in public service and every Sunday in church. I will never understand how a human being, let alone one elected to serve others, would willingly endanger the lives of their children for a little bit of money. Frankly, it makes me sick to my stomach.

Every American—Republican, Democrat, and Independent—wants to live in a country where they don't have to fear that dropping off their child at the bus stop may be the last time they see them alive.

Too many of us, however, accept this dystopian reality. The cycle of murder, devastation, and inaction has become so commonplace that most mass shootings don't even make the headlines. Outside of war zones, no country on Earth so consistently chooses to accept so much death and terror.

I certainly choose not to accept it. I choose to take necessary action to curb the scourge of gun violence in our country. I choose to fight for universal background checks, an assault weapons ban, and whatever it takes to protect our communities.

I dream of a safer America. I choose to keep fighting until it is no longer just a dream. Words mean nothing. Action is what we need.

CELEBRATING THE 190TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF AMITY AND COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 190th anniversary

of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce, the first treaty between the United States and Thailand.

In fact, the historic agreement is distinguished as the first treaty between the United States and any Asian country.

Since its establishment, the relationship and cooperation between our two nations has thrived, providing benefits to both of our economies and national security.

That is why earlier this month I introduced the bipartisan resolution reaffirming our gratitude for our partnership and our continued commitment to building our friendship.

As we celebrate the anniversary of the historic treaty of 1833, let us also reaffirm our efforts to strengthen our strategic partnerships, promote democracy, and secure our interests in Asia and around the world.

JUSTICE FOR BLACK FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, the history of farming and agriculture in the United States is unquestionably one-sided. Black farmers have lost over \$300 million worth of farmland in the last century due to a history of widespread discrimination, which has further exacerbated the wealth gap in America.

According to the most recent Census of Agriculture, there are 3,222 Black farmers in my home State of Louisiana. Nationally, Black farmers only represent 1.4 percent of more than 3 million farmers. Since the 1920s, the number of Black farmers has dropped from nearly a million to roughly around 50,000. Today, they own just around half of a percent of our farmland.

The Justice for Black Farmers Act confronts our history and will establish a brighter future for the underserved by reforming the USDA, providing debt relief, and creating a land grant program to encourage new generations of Black farmers. This bill seeks to correct persistent injustices and restore the land base that Black farmers have lost unjustly.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative ADAMS and Senator BOOKER for their leadership on this issue.

MASS SHOOTINGS IN AMERICA

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, a heavy heart because our country consistently turns a cheek, turns and looks away at the violence, the mass shootings that seem to be reported every day in the news.

It is simply not enough for my colleagues to come to the floor and offer condolences and well-wishing and prayer. While all those things are wonderful, in 2023 the people deserve action.

Our young people that are visiting with us deserve to be in a classroom that is safe. Our friends who worship in

churches and synagogues deserve to be able to worship in peace. People who walk their dogs or jog along the park should be able to do so without fear of a mass shooting. People should be able to go to a concert or a party and enjoy relative safety.

In this month alone: March 27, Tennessee, mass shooting; March 27, Wisconsin, mass shooting; March 26, Pennsylvania, mass shooting; March 26, Minnesota, mass shooting; March 26, Arkansas, mass shooting; March 26, Louisiana, mass shooting; March 25, Louisiana, mass shooting; March 25, New York, mass shooting; March 25, North Carolina, mass shooting; March 25, Illinois, mass shooting; March 24, Louisiana, mass shooting; March 23, Maryland, mass shooting; March 21, New Jersey, mass shooting; March 21, South Carolina, mass shooting; March 20, Wisconsin, mass shooting; March 18, Ohio, mass shooting; March 18, Illinois, mass shooting; March 18, Texas, mass shooting; March 15, Oregon, mass shooting; March 14, Alabama, mass shooting; March 13, Texas, mass shooting; March 12, Texas, mass shooting; March 11, New York, mass shooting; March 11, Washington, mass shooting; and March 10, Florida, mass shooting.

That is just this month alone. Let that sink in. At what point do we put people over profit? At what point do we challenge the gun makers to say: Listen, we are not talking about taking away your constitutional right to bear arms. We are talking about sensible gun control that will save these young people that are visiting us today, that will save these visitors that come to see their government at work.

This is not Republican or Democrat. This is about the survival of our communities. This is about the survival of our young people. This is about providing resources to make sure our communities are safe. Stop it. Stop protecting NRA and their profits and start protecting our children and their lives.

HONORING OUR VIETNAM VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today on this important day to commemorate those who served in Vietnam. I want to call attention to one servicemember, Colonel Marshall McRee, who passed from us just 4 years ago.

Colonel McRee started his life in North Carolina poor. He chose a college because they offered a football scholarship and clothing that he could not afford.

President Kennedy called him up to rush to Florida as a young officer in the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Colonel McRee went on to serve for 30 years. He did two tours in Vietnam. In early 1965, he served first as an adviser but then in the fierceness of battles in

1967 and 1968, in the Battle of Caisson, supporting the Marine Corps from his artillery position, supporting marines on long-range patrols during the day, and defending his perimeter all night.

Marshall McRee earned three Bronze Stars with a V for valor for his service to our country. He returned to a Nation that was ungrateful, and he returned to a Nation that spit upon him when he returned.

□ 1100

There are those in our highest levels of government today who are among those who protested against our veterans before, more recently, it became popular to support the veterans.

I want to add that Marshall McRee did not stand alone. His wife of over 50 years, Patricia McRee, was part of the fabric of the Army community that when the telegrams would bring news of loss, she was part of the fabric of women who came and supported young women who were now widows with children who were now fatherless. That was the Army and the fabric that they provided.

I am proud to talk about Colonel and Mrs. McRee because they have a beautiful daughter who happens to be my wife. I am very proud to be a part of their family, and I am proud to stand up and talk about the Vietnam veterans who deserve our respect.

REDUCING ENERGY PRICES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1 to lower energy costs for New York's 27th Congressional District.

As an expert in energy and a nuclear submarine officer in the Navy, I understand firsthand the importance of reliable energy for American families, businesses, and national security.

I stand here in support of H.R. 1 for the men and women of New York's 22nd District.

A constituent of mine, Steve Turner, shown right here behind me, is a Marine Corps veteran with cancer who is unable to pay his electric bills. Five days a week of treatment and soaring energy prices have brought this hero to his breaking point.

This is unacceptable. I can't cure Steve's cancer, but I will be damned if I let Steve continue to suffer the indignity of soaring energy costs taking food off his table.

H.R. 1 takes critical steps to promote American energy independence and will lower costs for people like Steve and the rest of central New York and the Mohawk Valley.

Burdensome regulations and radical policies are hurting working and middle-class Americans through no fault of their own—taking their jobs and putting our country last. Let's streamline the process by reinvigorating oil and natural gas production, renewables, and nuclear energy dominance. The Lower Energy Costs Act is a common-sense solution to our Nation's energy challenges.

Madam Speaker, Steve and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

WALL STREET PUSHES BACK ON REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, back in 2017, I took a public stand against Wall Street and its efforts to roll back the financial regulations put in place after the 2008 financial crisis. I opposed S. 2155, a deregulatory bill that ultimately passed into law.

Then, in 2017 and 2018, I was running for Congress for the first time in a politically divided district. Standing against Wall Street wasn't a safe position to take. In fact, that is why too many Republican and Democratic lawmakers alike ended up supporting S. 2155. It was seen as safer to be pro-business.

Every real capitalist knows there is nothing pro-business about a bank failure. That is why, in 2010, Congress passed strong regulations to keep our economy stable, our banks viable, and our businesses growing. Just 8 years later, in 2018, Washington, D.C., reversed course and passed S. 2155 at Wall Street's behest.

How did we get from this deregulation to the recent Silicon Valley Bank failure, the biggest bank failure in over a decade?

In short, S. 2155 made it lawful for Silicon Valley Bank to leave itself vulnerable when depositors wanted their money back faster than the bank could pay it out.

When you walk into a bank, Madam Speaker, and you deposit \$100, the bank takes most of that \$100 and invests it. They buy securities and bonds. They don't just have your \$100 sitting around. However, the bank is supposed to hang on to a big enough portion of that deposit so that if you want your money back, they can give it to you. It is straightforward when a couple of people come in and want their money, but sometimes a lot of people want all of their money all at once.

Why wasn't Silicon Valley Bank prepared for that scenario?

The bank's recent failure is a deregulation problem. Title IV of S. 2155 raised the asset threshold at which a bank is considered and regulated as a systemically important bank. What we saw in Silicon Valley Bank and other similarly sized banks is a result of Congress' own actions in 2018 when they were removed from these enhanced liquidity requirement stress testing and other safety and soundness rules.

Because of these lax regulations, when push came to shove, Silicon Valley Bank hadn't kept enough liquid assets to pay out the dollars being drawn out. If Dodd-Frank were still applied to banks of that size, then Silicon Valley Bank wouldn't have been able to put its own profits over the stability of our banking system and our economy.

Let's not give banks that choice again. When Silicon Valley Bank collapsed, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and I partnered on legislation to restore

the regulations that were directly implemented as a result of lessons learned during the 2008 financial crisis, not on the politics of the moment or the political power of the bank lobby.

Our new bill, the Secure Viable Banking Act, the SVB Act, would repeal title IV of S. 2155. It would restore Dodd-Frank regulations as they are applied to banks the same size as Silicon Valley Bank.

Banking failures are bad. We should all be able to come together and agree that systemically significant banks need regulations to limit the risks of failure and to reduce the harmful consequences when a bank does fail.

Let's agree to let Silicon Valley Bank be our last hard lesson. Let's not swing regulations back and forth with the political tides and whims of lobbyists. Let's, instead, keep rules in place that deliver a well-regulated, stable, and growing economy.

My SVB Act would do that.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill that creates a banking system that works for all of us, not just one that boosts banks' bottom lines.

CELEBRATING EDUCATION AND SHARING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize April 2 as Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson Education and Sharing Day.

April 2 is the Rebbe's birthday, and Rabbi Schneerson believed that education was not just about acquiring knowledge but also about developing a strong moral compass. He saw education as a tool for building a healthy and prosperous society, one that values compassion, justice, and kindness.

His vision has inspired countless individuals around the world to pursue excellence in education and to better serve their communities.

Through his tireless efforts, the Rebbe established over 5,500 educational and social institutions across the United States and in more than 100 countries. These institutions have empowered young people to reach their full potential and make a positive impact on society.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in celebrating Education and Sharing Day by reflecting on the Rebbe's legacy and commitment to education.

RECOGNIZING AUTISM AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MOLINARO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Autism Awareness Day, a day that promotes understanding and acceptance of individuals on the autism spectrum.

Autism is a complex neurological disorder that affects millions of individuals across the United States. It is also a spectrum disorder, which means each person's challenges can vary significantly.

As the father of four children, one of whom lives on the autism spectrum, this is deeply personal to me. April 2 is my daughter Abigail's birthday.

Happy birthday to her.

Before coming to Congress, I founded the ThinkDIFFERENTLY initiative in my home State to break down barriers and open opportunities for individuals with physical, intellectual, and developmental disabilities.

In Congress, we are working in a bipartisan way to expand on this effort. I started by introducing the Think Differently Database Act, which creates a comprehensive website of resources for individuals with disabilities.

This is just the beginning. We must do more to increase funding for autism research, expand access to early intervention services, and support families through education and outreach programs. These efforts will promote greater inclusivity and understanding and help every person of every ability reach their fullest potential.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Autism Awareness Day and continue supporting this critical work of breaking down barriers and creating opportunities for everyone of every ability.

CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, currently, California businesses are facing a significant tax increase, thanks in part to a high-ranking State official who allowed the tax dollars they had already paid to be stolen. It is an incompetence tax, a price private citizens are being forced to pay for their government's failures.

I would like to take a moment to explain how this happened, but I will lead with the punch line: The State official who squandered these funds, allowing a fraud of historic proportions, is somehow now up for a major promotion.

President Biden has nominated Julie Su, former head of the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, to be the next U.S. Secretary of Labor.

The predicament that small businesses in California now find themselves in—facing double taxation to compensate for the government's singular negligence—is another example of why this nomination is so ill-considered. It is a warning as to what all Americans have in store if Julie Su is confirmed.

Stepping back, the California Unemployment Insurance Fund is the source for paying out unemployment insurance claims honored by California's unemployment office, known as the EDD.

The fund is ordinarily maintained through a tax levied on California businesses. New employers are assigned a 3.4 percent UI rate for 2 to 3 years. After that, a business' contribution tax varies. It is somewhere between 1.5 and 6.2 percent for the current year.

In times of economic duress, when the fund is paying out significantly more than is coming in, the Federal Government has the option of loaning money to States, including California, to cover the payment deficit.

California had to take out such a loan during the COVID business shutdowns and took on by far the most debt of any State. The current debt amounts to \$18.8 billion. This was because of the huge volume of claims, yes, but also because of a staggering amount of fraud.

A coalition letter from dozens of Chambers of Commerce in California notes:

The Employment Development Department proved ill-equipped for the rapid increase in claimants. After numerous oversight hearings and analyses of EDD's failings, it is clear that EDD's failings added further to the UI fund's insolvency in two ways: by failing to prevent fraud and, instead, distributing funds to fraudulent claimants; and by mistakenly distributing overpayments to legitimate claimants. Although EDD and local law enforcement have attempted to recover some of these mistaken distributions, recovery rates appear to be less than 10 percent of the mistaken distributions. In other words, these mistakes at EDD added to the UI fund deficit.

□ 1115

The total scale of EDD fraud in California is estimated at \$32.6 billion. This unprecedented loss was almost entirely preventable if Julie Su had taken basic fraud prevention measures.

A January 2021 report from the California State auditor notes that the EDD fraud occurred for three main reasons:

First, EDD waited about 4 months to automate a key antifraud measure.

Second, EDD allowed claimants to collect benefits even though they were using suspicious addresses. In one case, over 1,700 claims came from a single address.

Third, EDD removed a key safeguard against improper payments without fully understanding the significance of the safeguard.

Further, the State auditor reports that: "Despite repeated warnings, EDD did not bolster its fraud detection efforts until months into the pandemic."

"And it does not reliably track suspicious claims and resolution to determine the effectiveness of its fraud prevention tools."

By the way, if you are wondering where all this money, \$32.6 billion went, the CEO of LexisNexis Risk Solutions has this to say: "Seventy percent of that money left California. It left this country. It went to transnational criminal groups that have used that money for nefarious purposes to harm our democracy. Some of that money has been used in sex trafficking, child extortion."

At this point, California is one of only four States in the country that hasn't repaid its debt to the Federal Government. Now, taxpaying businesses are on the hook. In the case of fund insolvency for 2 consecutive

years—as is the case with California—Federal law mandates an automatic increase in payroll taxes that amounts to \$21 per employee. The tax continues to ratchet up by \$21 per employee each year the fund remains insolvent, with a maximum tax increase of \$434 per employee per year.

Now, one might ask, why did California not repay its debt to the Federal Government last year when it had a \$97.5 billion surplus?

There is no good answer to that question.

I have actually joined with Representative OBERNOLTE to call on California's Governor and legislature to repay the loan so the burden doesn't fall on employers, and I am calling on the United States Senate to consider this a case study in what we don't want for our country.

UNSPEAKABLE TRAGEDY IN NASHVILLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember those lost in an unspeakable tragedy that took place in Nashville at the Covenant School, which is in my district, and to acknowledge the power of prayer.

At approximately 10:13 a.m., evil ran rampant in the halls of the Christian academy and claimed the lives of three children and three staff members:

Hallie Scruggs, age 9;

Evelyn Dieckhaus, age 9;

William Kinney, age 9;

Mike Hill, the school custodian;

Dr. Katherine Koonce, the head of the school; and

Cynthia Peak, a substitute teacher.

These innocent lives were lost in a senseless act of violence.

As a father of three children, I cannot begin to imagine what the families of these six individuals are experiencing right now.

To my fellow Tennesseans in Nashville and the Covenant School, we are here for you. We are sending our deepest and most sincere condolences. My prayers are with each and every one of you.

I also want to recognize the bravery demonstrated by the Metropolitan Nashville Police Department and to all of the first responders who took exemplary steps during this tragic event.

To Officers Rex Engelbert and Michael Collazo, thank you. Your incredible bravery, valor, and courage in the face of danger saved lives.

Our community is broken. To those who are wondering and trying to make sense of the world, the Lord says: "So do not fear, for I am with you; do not be dismayed for I am your God. I will strengthen you and help you; I will uphold you with my righteous right hand." Isaiah 41:10.

Please join me for a moment of silence.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DALE DEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and memory of Commissioner Dale Dees from my hometown of Fernandina Beach, Florida.

Mr. Dees reminds me of an Alan Jackson country song, "Small Town Southern Man." He was always proud of what he had, and he was raised on the ways of gentle kindness.

Mr. Dees was a lifelong resident of Fernandina Beach. He came from humble beginnings, and yet he was a man of great influence. His sincerity made everyone feel special.

As a young man, he enlisted in the United States Army, serving Uncle Sam. Once he completed his tour of duty, he devoted himself to his family's dry cleaner business and revolutionized dry cleaning in Fernandina Beach by opening a drive-through option. Eventually, he would open the town's first gun shop. He was a self-made businessman, and he understood the value of hard work.

His pride and joy was his family. Sharon was his beloved wife of 62 years and was his soulmate. Together they were blessed with two children, Mike and Michelle; son-in-law Shawn; two grandchildren, and great-grandson Kamden.

Dale exemplified the meaning of leadership, and he saw public service as a duty. He served two terms as commissioner for Fernandina Beach and strived to make a difference in the lives of everyone in the city.

Fernandina Beach has lost a pillar of its community. Dale will be dearly missed, and our condolences are with his family. He truly was a small town Southern man.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, on this 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war, we pray Your divine blessing on those veterans who left hearth and home to respond to the

call of our Nation. We give tribute to their faithfulness to the ideals of freedom and democracy, even when the winds of war blew with increasing uncertainty.

We pray for those who, in the ambiguity of conflict, found themselves facing unimaginable ethical dilemmas and who are now left with indelible moral trauma. Bless those who yet tend to lingering physical and emotional injury. Give each of them peace when the nightmares overwhelm and the echoes of battle resound in their slumber.

May all who returned unwelcomed find themselves received into Your warm embrace and upheld by Your loving and everlasting arms. In Your mercy, sanctify the lives of those who remain missing in action and preserve the memory of the ones who never made it home.

Grant eternal rest to those comrades ever memorialized on granite walls and gravestones across the country. May they now know Your peace.

Holy and merciful God, mend the wounds of war, both seen and unseen, individual and corporate—that as we commemorate this anniversary, we would acknowledge the cost of war and honor the value of peace.

In the everlasting strength of Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HOULAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING RYAN REDINGTON

(Mr. TIFFANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ryan Redington on winning the 2023 Iditarod Sled Dog Race, traveling almost 1,000 miles in 8 days, 21 hours, 12 minutes, and 58 seconds.

Ryan has competed in the Iditarod 16 times, and although he may not be

from Wisconsin's Seventh District, he spends his fall and winter utilizing the lands in Douglas County to train his sled dogs for the race.

This is not the Redington family's first time in the Iditarod. Ryan's grandfather is one of the cofounders of the race and is now known as the Father of the Iditarod.

Ryan has shown us what patience and dedication look like after recovering from being hit by a snowmobile last year, and I am pleased that my district got to assist in bringing him and his dogs to victory.

Congratulations, Ryan, on achieving your lifelong dream.

EXPLOITING MEDICARE THROUGH ACO REACH

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, corporate profiteers have no place in Medicare, but some private insurers don't give patients a choice.

The Biden administration has taken important steps to change the direct contracting model, which stripped seniors of traditional Medicare and moved them to private coverage—without their consent.

Its successor program, ACO REACH, still invites private actors to exploit Medicare to boost their bottom lines. For-profit insurers can pocket taxpayer dollars that they don't spend on their patients. Too many have long histories of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Now, the administration is expanding ACO REACH, including doubling its coverage of underserved communities. As a result, millions on Medicare may soon face higher costs, smaller provider networks, and worse care.

Strong guardrails are needed now, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for patients and get corporate greed out of Medicare.

EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS OF PARENTS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, parents everywhere must have the ability to make educational decisions for their children. Though an obvious right, unfortunately, many school districts have been influenced by extremist special interest groups ignoring parental wishes.

In response, House Republicans, led by Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX, passed the Parents Bill of Rights Act. This legislation will make clear to schools that parents have a right to know what is being taught to their children, be heard by teachers and school boards, see the school budget and spending, protect the privacy of children, and keep their children safe.

As a parent of four sons, Roxanne and I appreciate local elected school boards running schools. As a grandfather, I want my sons and daughters-in-law to have the same level of oversight for our nine grandchildren.

I am grateful for the leadership of Ellen Weaver, the South Carolina Superintendent of Education, a champion for the rights of parents.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the safe haven of Afghanistan to America.

God bless our Vietnam veterans.

CELEBRATING INTERNATIONAL TRANSGENDER DAY OF VISIBILITY

(Ms. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, this Friday is International Transgender Day of Visibility, a time each year when we uplift and recognize the strength and resilience of the trans community.

The United States is home to 1.6 million trans youth and adults—1.6 million siblings, grandparents, brothers, sisters, friends, coworkers, and loved ones.

At a moment when trans-Americans are under direct attack in States across our Nation and in this body, I am here today to honor and celebrate each of these courageous, inspiring human beings just trying to live and be treated with dignity and respect.

I am here to say to each of you, no matter what you are hearing in your communities or from some Members of this body, you are loved, you are valued, and you are worthy.

Over the past 40 years, our country has made progress, but this is a moment and a critical reminder that we still have work to do.

As we mark International Trans Day of Visibility, we also remember that we must never take our feet off the gas pedal when it comes to this critical fight.

Please know I am always in your corner.

A SAD DAY FOR WOMEN'S SPORTS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, ESPN celebrated Women's History Month by putting out a tweet celebrating swimmer Lia Thomas. The only problem, Lia Thomas is not a woman.

Lia, whose real name is William, is a man pretending to be a woman, ranked about 400 in men's swimming, but now about number 1 in women's.

This individual identifying as a woman was allowed to compete in women's swimming for the University of Pennsylvania. Consequently, this

person won a national title that should have gone to a female athlete.

Instead of denouncing this farcical nonsense, ESPN decided to celebrate it. It is a sad day for women's sports when our Nation's premier sports broadcaster chooses to celebrate biological males competing in women's sports.

The evidence is overwhelming that males have competitive athletic advantage over females. It, therefore, makes zero sense to allow men to compete in women's sports.

Do you call this progress? Certainly not for women athletes.

END HUNGER NOW

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, every day across America, millions of seniors take their medicines on an empty stomach. They are hungry, on a fixed income, can't drive—and their fridges, pocketbooks, and wallets are empty.

If they are lucky, they have people like Janice Pierce and Maggie Woodward in their corner.

Last week, I joined Janice and Maggie to deliver meals to seniors in Oakham, Massachusetts. They are one of thousands of Meals on Wheels chapters in America.

Experts tell us that seniors who are hungry are more likely to get sick and be admitted to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, programs like Meals on Wheels aren't nice; they are a necessity. While they do good work, America's seniors shouldn't have to get lucky. Their health outcomes shouldn't be determined by whether heroes like Janice and Maggie live around the corner.

Congress needs to strengthen, not cut, programs like Meals on Wheels, as some of my Republican friends are proposing.

In the richest country in the history of the world, our seniors deserve no less.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

HONORING THE HEROES OF WEST READING, PENNSYLVANIA

(Ms. HOULAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, tragedy struck my community when an explosion rocked the R.M. Palmer chocolate factory in West Reading, claiming the lives of seven people and injuring many others.

Most people know Palmer chocolate for their Easter bunnies and other holi-

day treats, but we know them as an important part of our community.

Since the tragedy, our first responders have been heroes.

Our neighbors, nonprofits, and local businesses have set up programs to help and, in some cases, literally have given the shirts off their backs for those who were impacted.

Similarly, and also not surprisingly in our community, government leaders at the local, State, and Federal levels are also on the ground, collaborating together to support our community and recovery.

I speak today full of grief for the families and friends of those whom we have lost, and I speak today full of gratitude for the strength and dedication of so many in our community who are doing so much.

We see you, and we honor you. We are very proud to stand with you.

SUPPORT LOWER ENERGY COSTS

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, Americans have been hit hard by the high fuel prices caused by the Biden administration's anti-energy policies.

Today, Virginia families are paying \$3.30 a gallon at the pump for regular gasoline, over a dollar more than when President Biden took office. That is why we are bringing to the floor H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. This legislation will reduce costs by increasing domestic energy production, cutting burdensome red tape, and reforming the permitting process.

Folks, it is evident that Joe Biden has waged war on America's energy independence. That war ends today.

House Republicans are working to put America back in the driver's seat of energy production by voting for the Lower Energy Costs Act so families can keep more of their hard-earned paychecks.

I urge every one of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

COMMEMORATING VIETNAM WAR VETERANS DAY

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, March 29, to commemorate Vietnam War Veterans Day and honor those who served in this conflict.

We acknowledge and deeply appreciate the sacrifices made by our brave soldiers, their families, and the communities that supported them.

We also need to make sure that we honor our POW-MIA Gold Star families who lost their loved ones or still endure the uncertainty of their fate during the war.

In addition to representing a large community of Vietnam vets, I have the

distinct honor of having a Gold Star daughter, Maureen Hickman Caporaso, serve in my office. Her father, United States Air Force Captain Vincent J. Hickman, is one of the 1,553 service-members still unaccounted for to this day.

We must never forget the sacrifices of these families, and we must do everything in our power to continue searching and bring closure to those who still wait for their loved ones to return.

Why keep searching after all these years? Because you never leave a fallen American behind.

To the veterans of the Vietnam war, we offer a long-overdue welcome home. We honor your courage and your commitment to our country, and we thank you for your unwavering dedication to defending our freedom.

Today, let us recognize the immense sacrifices made by our servicemembers, their families, and the entire Nation during the Vietnam war.

□ 1215

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE ORDER OF REINDEER

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Benevolent Protective Order of Reindeer.

This organization is one of New Jersey's oldest African-American fraternal organizations. It was founded in 1923 in response to the prejudice in other animal lodges.

Early organizations named after animals would not let African Americans become members, so the Benevolent Protective Order of Reindeer was formed and invited everyone to join.

Today, the organization's principles of service, unity, and charity are represented in its exceptional social work. In addition, it provides scholarships for worthy students and engages in community activism to fight for social justice.

The Benevolent Protective Order of Reindeer is an outstanding organization in my district, and I am proud to celebrate its 100th anniversary on the House floor today.

IN SUPPORT OF LABOR UNIONS

(Mr. MAGAZINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best ways for workers to get the pay and benefits that they deserve and to raise their families and provide for them is to join a labor union.

Unions have helped millions of American families join the middle class, including thousands in Rhode Island. The

freedom to join a union is the most fundamental right afforded to all workers in this country.

Unfortunately, that right is constantly under attack by big companies that spend millions and millions of dollars engaging in intimidation and retaliation against those seeking to exercise their right to unionize.

What is worse is that companies are often allowed to write off the expenses for union busting from their taxes. You heard that right. All of us, the taxpayers of America, are paying for companies to intimidate workers out of joining unions.

This has to stop. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the No Tax Breaks for Union Busting Act, led by Representative NORCROSS because enough is enough. We need to make it easier in this country for workers to join a union if they choose to do so, and we certainly should not be giving tax breaks to companies to intimidate workers out of exercising that right.

LOWER ENERGY COSTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFANY). Pursuant to House Resolution 260 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1220

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, with Mr. CLOUD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, 3 hours remained in general debate.

Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) will each control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

My goal as the chair of Energy and Commerce Committee is to make sure Americans have access to affordable, reliable energy. This was a key promise in the House Republicans' "Commitment to America," and we are hitting

the ground running to deliver on that promise. This is just the beginning.

Energy is foundational to everything. For centuries it has driven human progress and development. It is why America has done more to lift people out of poverty and raise the standard of living than anywhere else in the world.

Today, over 3.7 billion people are living in energy poverty. That is half the world. They have a 10-year lower life expectancy, 35 percent fewer years of education, and many don't have electricity at all.

Here in the United States of America, we are blessed with the ability and the resources to continue to raise the standard of living globally and even lift people out of poverty.

Our goal today is to celebrate how our abundant energy resources have unleashed prosperity and invited people from around the world to come across the globe to America to achieve their hopes and dreams.

We have accomplished this as a leader in reducing emissions and with the highest environmental and labor standards in the world. We cannot afford to move backward with a reckless command-and-control so-called climate agenda that forces people to pay more and go without reliable electricity.

H.R. 1 prioritizes the American people over this radical climate agenda.

On his first day in office, President Biden started a war on American energy. Predictably, gas prices skyrocketed to the highest levels in American history. President Biden revoked the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline, imposed a moratorium on oil production on Federal lands, and directed agencies across the Federal Government to impose punitive and burdensome regulations.

As the American people suffered, President Biden turned to OPEC and Russia to boost supplies. In the face of Russia's aggression, President Biden looked the other way and green-lit the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, emboldening Russia to attack Ukraine. The CCP now is deepening ties with Russia and consolidating its control over more than 90 percent of the world's critical mineral supplies.

To win the future, we cannot allow our energy security to be surrendered to our adversaries. H.R. 1 sends the strong and unmistakable signal to restore American energy dominance and bolster our national security. H.R. 1 will unleash American energy, lower costs, and secure our supply chains. This package helps lift barriers to expanding our energy supplies, remove red tape for exporting and importing LNG, and build more pipelines with our North American allies and across the States.

It would repeal President Biden's burdensome natural gas tax, which will harm communities, shut down production, and raise prices across the entire economy.

H.R. 1 will encourage innovation and production of critical materials here at

home to cut China out of our energy supply chains and ensure America is leading the world in innovation and next-generation energy technologies.

We have heard a lot of talk, and Democrats are forcing a so-called transition that requires the American people to suffer through supply chains and price hikes. What Republicans are offering through H.R. 1 is a commitment to energy expansion that will deliver on lower costs and reliable and affordable energy.

The fact is, higher costs are making life unaffordable for hardworking people in this country while forcing us to be dangerously reliant on Chinese supply chains that are dirtier and use slave labor.

I think about the farmer who told us that this so-called climate agenda is raising the cost of food and making it harder for farmers to feed our families; an advocate who shared with our committee that record-high energy costs hurt low-income and minority families the most; and the mayor of Midland who told us her community is thriving because of the investment in jobs the oil and gas industry brings.

We must embrace and expand America's position as the number one energy producer in the world while continuing our leadership to reduce emissions.

People all over this Nation are counting on us for a better quality of life. With H.R. 1, we will boost energy production, lift regulatory burdens for the construction of more energy infrastructure, cut China out of our critical material supply chains, and lower costs across the board. This is how we build a more secure future for Americans.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of H.R. 1, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1. The Republicans call it the Lower Energy Costs Act. In fact, it does the opposite, and it puts polluters over people, so we call it the polluters over people act. That is justified because that is exactly what it does.

This bill is nothing more than a grab bag of Big Oil giveaways and loopholes that endanger the health, safety, and security of Americans. It does absolutely nothing to lower energy costs for American families. In fact, it will actually drive up costs while doubling down on costly fossil fuels.

Now, does the GOP really believe that Big Oil cares about Americans?

During the COVID crisis in the last 3 years, we had a hearing where we brought in some of the large oil companies. It was quite clear that they wanted to keep prices high. It was quite clear that they were benefitting from OPEC and the fact that Russia had invaded Ukraine and that oil supplies had become more limited because of that invasion of Ukraine and that as a result, prices for oil and gasoline were going up. They didn't care. They liked it.

We actually asked them at the hearing whether or not they would increase

production because they have so many leases on Federal lands that they don't use, and they said no. They said maybe eventually they would do that, but they haven't gotten around to it yet. I don't think they have gotten around to it still.

So this notion that somehow by benefiting Big Oil, the major American so-called oil companies, that this is going to help the American people, that is not their goal.

Last year, Big Oil's profits in 2022 were \$451 billion, a record high. The dividends they gave out and the stock buyouts amounted to \$163 billion. They only care about the stockholders. They don't care about the price of gasoline. They want it to stay high. They don't care whether Americans can afford gasoline.

□ 1230

Chairwoman RODGERS, who I really respect a lot, talked about LNG. One of the things in the bill is it removes the requirement—and I am going to talk about other things it does—but it removes the requirement that liquified natural gas exports be determined to be in the public interest before being sent overseas.

That is going to lead to more American LNG being sent to our adversaries, including China. This helps China. This doesn't hurt China. This helps China. We know that there was a time a few years ago when LNG exports were limited because of—I forget what caused it—and during that period of time, the evidence shows the price for American gasoline or American crude was actually going down.

When you send LNG overseas, it is not available here in the United States. That actually lowers gas prices when you have more gasoline available or more refineries available to process gasoline here in the United States.

I debunk this idea that somehow this bill is going to lower prices here, that somehow benefiting Big Oil benefits Americans, that somehow exporting more LNG hurts China. These things simply are not the case. The evidence proves very much to the contrary.

This bill, H.R. 1, I will call it the polluters over people act, rescinds several transformational climate programs that the Democrats enacted as part of the Inflation Reduction Act last year. What I am trying to get across today is that at the same time that they are helping Big Oil, not driving down prices, and helping China, the Republicans are also tearing down all of the environmental laws that we have had for the last 50 years and putting all the emphasis on fossil fuels rather than clean energy.

The bottom line is, the only way that we are going to lower costs is by encouraging clean energy. Yes, I agree with Chairwoman RODGERS that the United States has to be a bigger energy producer, but the future for that is with clean energy, not with pumping more oil and gas. It is by encouraging

clean energy because that is where we can be the big producer. That is where the future is. That is where we can outcompete the rest of the world.

What does this bill do?

It foolishly repeals the \$27 billion Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which invests in high-impact projects that reduce pollution, creates good-paying clean energy jobs, and improves public health. They obviously do not want to do anything for clean energy.

It also repeals the methane emissions reduction program, which protects the health of our communities and ensures that polluters, not taxpayers or customers, pay for wasted methane. Let me use that as an example. I want everyone to understand that when we passed the Inflation Reduction Act and we were trying to cut back on greenhouse gases which lead to global climate problems and the increase in global warming, we worked hard to deal with those industries here that could be affected. The Methane Emissions Reduction Act is a perfect example that we worked with the independent oil producers because they said, well, if you cause the methane that is wasted now and goes into the atmosphere and causes this increased number of greenhouse gases, if you work with us, we can accomplish capturing this methane and then it can be recycled, but we need some money to accomplish that.

We provided them with a fund so they could make that transition. We also said that if it took them time to get a permit to capture the gas and provide a recycling program for the methane, that they would not be penalized by doing that.

This has been characterized by the GOP as some sort of tax or fee on the industry. It is really a penalty if they don't do what is necessary to capture methane and avoid it going into the atmosphere. The same is true for almost every provision that they seek to repeal here.

These are provisions that try to protect the public health, reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, but at the same time don't have a negative impact on those industries that are hiring people and that create jobs. At the same time, try to move toward new clean energy things like wind, solar, and more hydropower, and other things that actually do create more jobs, as we have proven that they have.

There are so many other things that repeal—I won't go through all of them because I know that we have other speakers. The bill also repeals the popular home electrification rebates that are specifically designed to lower energy bills for American families. These are popular incentives that will save families money and are urgently needed to help us fight the climate crisis.

Republicans are rejecting all these things that help people save money, help reduce greenhouse gases so they can double-down on the old pro-polluter policies that they have had for

years. This bill also does nothing to meaningfully address permitting reform.

Its vision of permitting consists of letting polluters do whatever they want, and instead, the bill becomes a sweetheart deal. The bill, for example, doesn't include any changes to the transmission policy necessary to ensure that clean energy can reach all corners of the country.

Let me also give you a couple of other examples. The biggest thing that they do to basically endanger all of our environmental protections is they exempt so-called critical energy resources from the Clean Air Act and hazardous waste permitting requirements.

They say if we label a refinery or if we label a utility as a critical energy resource, then they don't have to follow the Clean Air Act, they don't have to follow the Clean Water Act, and they don't have to follow the Hazardous Waste Act. It is a roundabout way of saying that we are just going to let all these industries do whatever they want, even though it undercuts public health protections.

They do the same thing with toxic chemicals. We had a major toxic chemical bill to try to cut back on toxic chemicals that needlessly expose families and children to health risks. They basically get rid of that by saying, oh, those facilities don't have to worry about releasing toxic chemicals.

Mr. Chair, I end by saying this. Democrats understand that the transition to clean energy is important. In fact, projects already underway are valued at tens of billions of dollars and have already created more than 100,000 good-paying jobs.

Our Inflation Reduction Act is estimated to create 9 million new jobs over the coming decade and reduce energy costs by an average of \$1,800 per year.

What we have done in the last few years as Democrats is to try to move toward clean energy, understanding that you still have to have fossil fuels and nuclear and other things, but understanding that the future in terms of the U.S. being a major energy producer is in clean energy, not in fossil fuels.

To just wreck and put a bulldozer through all our environmental protections in order to encourage fossil fuels is just a huge mistake. It is not going to lower energy costs. It is going to make it much more difficult for us to reduce greenhouse gases and all the negative impacts of climate change.

There is nothing in here. In my opinion, this bill is also going to hurt us from a national security point of view because it does actually help China and help our adversaries rather than making it more difficult for them to compete with us.

Mr. Chair, I would urge opposition to the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), a

leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 1, the most important bill and the priority for this Congress.

When I came to Congress, I made it my mission to spread the word about the Permian Basin, the heartbeat of American energy and the largest secure supply of oil and gas.

I am incredibly proud to represent the men and women of the Permian Basin, who have revolutionized the way we produce energy in order to provide us with an incredible national security and economic asset.

Unfortunately, President Biden has demonized the very people that I represent. He has demonized the people of West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

From his policies, like killing the Keystone XL pipeline and shutting down drilling permitting, but however, begging foreign dictators to produce more oil, his rhetoric, literally promising to end fossil fuels, he has used every tool in the toolkit to build a bureaucracy that is completely obsessed and opposed to killing American energy. His policies have driven energy costs and inflation through the roof.

Today, I say to the American public: You are going to hear a lot of misinformation about the Inflation Reduction Act, which did nothing to curb inflation.

Energy policies by this administration have increased costs for American families. Americans are being forced to pay 40 percent more on gasoline since the President took office, 20 to 30 percent more on their electricity bills. It is all in the name of a climate crusade, which can't even come close to what the Permian Basin and other producing areas in this country have done to reduce harmful emissions and provide affordable and clean reliable energy.

In fact, I spoke to the president of IPAA yesterday. What we just heard was that the Independent Producers of America support the Democrats' policies. That couldn't be further from the truth. I asked them that. They said no, industry was not consulted.

Over the past 10 years we have brought down methane emissions by almost 15 percent. No government mandate could come close to that. We are only beginning to tap into the incredible asset that is liquified natural gas. Not only is it good for our environment, but it is good for the economy.

We heard this when we took the Energy and Commerce Committee on the road and we talked to Mayor Blong in Midland, Texas, and we heard this from the producers. Today, we will likely continue to hear about Big Oil. The Big Oil boogeyman that doesn't actually exist.

The truth is, and I would face the Democrats, my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and tell you what the IPAA told us, and what they continue to tell us: 90 percent of our energy is produced by small, inde-

pendent producers, companies that have 10, 20, 30 employees. Big Oil?

You are talking to the people of West Virginia when you say that. When Democrats and this administration blame Big Oil, they are talking about my district.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act is a complete rejection of the Biden administration's anti-energy policies that have been aimed at workers throughout this country for 2 years. We are fighting back. We want to produce American-made oil. We want to boost American products in order to reduce inflation.

I am extremely proud to have worked on this legislation that includes my bill to reduce taxes on natural gas. This is just the beginning. House Republicans are going to follow through on our commitment to the American public and on our commitment to American families.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, passing H.R. 1 is just the beginning. The American public put their trust in Republicans under Speaker MCCARTHY and Chair MCMORRIS RODGERS to lower costs, and that is exactly what we are going to do by boosting American production instead of siding with Russia, Iran, and China.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand with America to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I rise in deep opposition to H.R. 1, or as we have heard, the polluters over people act.

When House Democrats had an opportunity to bring an H.R. 1 to the floor, it was to protect Americans' sacred right to vote and curb the influence of dark money and politics.

Compare that to this H.R. 1, which is nothing short of a bonanza for corporate polluters.

It creates loopholes in our Nation's most important environmental laws, laws that exist to ensure Americans have clean air, that they have clean water, and do not need to live in fear of industrial accidents in their backyards.

It does this so that the richest oil and gas companies in the world can indeed continue to achieve a record-breaking bit of profits at the expense of everyday Americans. We know the best way for us to avoid volatile fossil fuel price shocks is to become less reliant on fossil energy by transitioning to a strong, clean energy future, one that will also protect our air and our water and create millions of well-paying American jobs.

This is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act is doing. New clean energy projects are underway across our country. There have been tens of billions of

dollars in domestic manufacturing announcements, which will ensure that solar panels, wind turbines, batteries, EVs, and the other technologies we will need will be made here in America.

This bill seeks to stop that progress. It would repeal critical sections of the IRA. The greenhouse gas reduction fund will leverage private funding to make clean energy investments across the country, including in disadvantaged communities.

The methane emissions reduction program is going to drive down highly potent climate pollution from the oil and gas sector. New rebates will enable low- and moderate-income Americans to save significant money by upgrading their appliances. These programs will be wiped out by this bill.

□ 1245

Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to examining how we can improve permitting processes, but it must be done with the intention of accelerating the clean energy transition—building out our transmission infrastructure to enable our electricity system to be cleaner, more reliable, and, yes, more affordable.

Unfortunately, this bill is only interested in giveaways to outdated, outmoded, and polluting industries, not in bringing our energy system into this 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I introduced in concurrence with Representative LESKO to defend America's ability to purchase and use natural gas stoves, a common household appliance found in over one-third of American households.

Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Energy are threatening access to natural gas stoves for millions of Americans through the rulemaking process. This amendment would stop the DOE from denying Americans the freedom to cook on the range of their choosing.

According to the Department of Energy's own analysis, in 2020, 38 percent of Americans used natural gas to cook in their homes. The Energy Information Administration says cooking with gas is three times cheaper than cooking with electricity.

Americans should have access to the cooking appliances that they deem fit. They do not want or need the Federal Government to dictate what is in their kitchens. The Department of Energy's own research estimates that 50 percent of gas stoves on the market today don't meet the proposed standards, which means these households would have to remove them.

This is a direct attack on natural gas consumption in this country and an example of the Biden administration's

desire to control every decision we make. Americans should have the freedom to choose their appliances, and Federal Government intrusion is unwarranted and unwanted.

Furthermore, this rule is essentially a tax on consumers, who are already being squeezed by inflation. My Democratic colleagues may argue that these rules were crafted with the purpose of saving consumers money. The DOE estimates the regulation would reduce energy use by 3.4 percent, resulting in a whopping \$21.89 saved over a gas range's lifetime. This would save consumers \$1.45 per year of the 15-year lifespan of a gas range.

This minuscule savings indicates this regulation isn't actually about consumers' pocketbooks. It is about Federal control at the behest of the radical green policy groups.

People should be free to choose their cooking appliances based on what they need rather than on what the government requires. If a consumer wants a gas stove that cooks faster, then they should be free to choose it, and if a consumer wants a gas stove that cooks slowly but more efficiently, then they should be free to choose that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, no one should have their choices limited by Federal bureaucrats. In fact, these bureaucrats should not have the ability to implement rules like this at all without congressional approval.

This amendment shows the clear difference in vision between House Republicans and the Biden administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support consumers and their freedom to choose what they prefer in their kitchens by supporting this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is the ranking member of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1. This bill puts the needs of the oil industry over the health and well-being of the American people. Instead of protecting the communities we are here to represent, the bill will cause real harm to people's health and further degrade our environment.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim the bill will help lower Americans' energy costs and make us energy independent, in fact, the bill does just the opposite.

Here is why. By opening LNG exports and doubling down on fossil fuels, this legislation will further increase our reliance on the global oil and gas markets. It will further subject us to the volatility of the global marketplace. Frankly, it will do nothing to increase our security here at home because we

simply can't drill our way toward lower energy costs.

The only way to bring energy costs down here in America, and to make our Nation truly energy independent, is to expedite the transition to more renewable forms of energy.

In addition, any claim that this legislation does not touch some part of our Nation's most important environmental laws is just untrue. The bill decimates the laws that were put in place to protect our air, water, and, most of all, our health. It repeals key provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, provisions that actually bring down the costs for Americans and reduce emissions.

So now, instead of working with us to find real bipartisan solutions to the crises we face, the majority severely limited amendments to this bill in violation of the promises they made at the beginning.

I offered some commonsense amendments to the legislation that, unfortunately, were not made in order. One would have restricted the use of eminent domain for natural gas pipelines to ensure communities have a voice in our energy decisions. The other would have required a simple analysis to eliminate methane emissions from projects under NEPA review.

However, we don't have the ability to have those conversations because the majority doesn't want to hear it. I want to say what I said in the committee markup: Mr. Chair, once my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get this out of their system, I stand willing, ready, and able to work on a bipartisan solution that will both help increase our energy security in the United States and will make us independent from a volatile foreign oil market.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1. This bill will unleash American energy and reduce gasoline and energy prices for all Americans.

Look at this chart. Since Biden has taken office, gasoline prices have gone up 51 percent, utility gas prices have gone up 44 percent, and electricity prices have gone up for Americans 24 percent.

H.R. 1 is here to help Americans with these outrageous cost-of-living increases.

I am honored that my legislation to disapprove of President Biden's decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline was included in this package. President Biden's decision to cancel the pipeline was a terrible decision that led to increased gasoline prices and the loss of thousands and thousands of jobs.

Now is the time to stand up for the American people. Now is the time to help reduce the cost of gasoline, utility

gas, and electricity. Now is the time to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, by its position, H.R. 1 reflects a top priority of the House majority. There is much that my constituents in Houston agree we should be prioritizing in this Congress when it comes to energy—not only lowering energy costs, which is the bill's title—but strengthening our energy security, ensuring and enabling domestic energy production of all kinds, and ensuring our energy future.

That comes from serious legislating. That comes from listening. That comes from stakeholders of all kinds coming to the table to grapple with the competing interests here and come up with workable, durable policy.

That is, unfortunately, not what we have in this massive bill and not what we are seeing in this Chamber in our debates on energy policy here or across the country. That is a problem.

I have warned and will continue to warn that the politicization of energy policy and energy production is one of the most dangerous things that is happening in this country right now, and I am sorry to see that this debate is no different.

We simply cannot repeat cursory talking points and epithets that do not get to the complex and urgent challenges in front of us. There are real and dire consequences for our people who produce the energy that we need and use every day and for our environment if we cannot get it together enough to take this work seriously here.

We must move from politics to policy. I can't go through all the policy in this bill in the time that I have here. However, I do agree that we must reform the permitting process, that we should continue exports of oil and natural gas, that we need an offshore leasing plan, that we should increase offshore revenue to coastal States, that we need to secure critical minerals, and other ideas contained in this bill.

However, H.R. 1 contains so many unworkable provisions that create unrealistic deadlines, threaten our national security, and repeal key environmental and public health protections and programs—including the historic work that we did just in the last Congress in the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce methane emissions, incentivize clean energy investment, and protect communities—that I cannot vote for the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the work we did in the Inflation Reduction Act was to reduce methane emissions, incentivize clean energy investment, and protect communities. Because of

that and because this bill repeals that important work, I cannot vote for it.

People here in Washington understand that this bill is a messaging bill that will not be taken up in the Senate. With this vote, this is my message: When it comes to energy, it is time to put aside politics and get to the policy.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW), who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, energy is the most important element of a prosperous society. Nothing else functions without it.

Reliable electricity allows us to work at night, keep our sick and injured on life support, heat our homes in freezing weather, manufacture the materials that we use to build our homes, and powers the systems that allow the public to watch these remarks right here on this House floor.

Energy is connected to everything. The price of energy affects the price of everything else, and the world devolves into the Dark Ages without it.

This might explain why Republicans think an energy bill should be labeled H.R. 1—because it is our number one priority, as it should be.

We have to introduce this bill because, bewilderingly, energy security has been under relentless attack by radical leftists and the Biden administration. They don't believe in energy security. They don't believe in reliable, affordable energy. They seem to think that the only energy worth pursuing is so-called renewables, solar and wind.

This is not sound policy or science. This has become a religion, and it has become an irrational pursuit of intermittent, weather-dependent energy sources that take up vast amounts of land, vast amounts of resources to make, and vast amounts of critical minerals to be mined. Still, it doesn't deliver the energy security the American people need.

I am not against these things. It would be fine to pursue these technologies if it didn't also come with a simultaneous attack on the sources of energy that actually work—namely, oil and gas.

Every good thing you have in this world, Mr. Chairman, is because of petroleum products—every single thing. Your shoes, your cars, your iPhones, your Netflix, your Patagonia jackets, medical devices that save your life, your heating, your cooling—literally everything comes from petroleum products.

The attack on oil and gas has been relentless, and it has been deeply foolish. It started with day one of the Biden administration and the Keystone pipeline, then executive orders banning new leases on Federal lands, and then refusal to permit pipelines. Then they turn around and attack the suppliers and producers for higher prices. It is pure gaslighting.

They have drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, all while prioritizing

the same crazy climate policies that have caused Europe to enter an energy crisis and that are now causing developing nations to be priced out of gas markets and turn to coal production.

This gets me to quite the irony here. The administration's policies are more likely to increase global carbon emissions as a result, and for one simple reason. I really want everyone to understand this. By refusing to push for increased natural gas exports, we are shelving the best tool for displacing coal power around the world.

Coal burned in foreign countries accounts for about 50 percent of global power emissions. Natural gas is an easy substitute with half the emissions. American natural gas could easily be leveraged to increase prosperity for all and reduce emissions.

This is not rocket science. It is common sense. It is just math. Promoting American natural gas is better for energy security, better for our own affordability, and better for reducing global emissions. There is no logical counterargument to what I just said. There is not one.

Maybe—I believe this—the Biden administration actually knows this. That is why they prefer oil production in foreign countries and beg them to drill so that we can pretend we care about the climate while allowing other countries to do the dirty work for us.

□ 1300

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this dangerous and irresponsible bill.

With extreme weather events becoming more and more frequent, and climate change impacting our communities, agriculture, homes, and even our national security, we need to work together to advance climate rescue measures that move the U.S. away from fossil fuel dependence, protect workers and communities, and strengthen environmental protections, all while reducing costs to the American people.

This can't happen overnight, but instead of building upon the historic, deficit-reducing provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, Republicans are trying to roll back that historic bill, and in the process they are putting polluters over people and the planet.

H.R. 1 restricts community input by gutting NEPA. It forces the sell-off of public lands and undermines the health of all Americans by compromising air and water quality, all while adding billions to our national debt.

Of particular interest in my district is that this bill would block the EPA from requiring refineries to study alternatives to the use of hydrofluoric acid—or HF—in fossil fuel processing. HF has the potential to form a poisonous, killing aerosol cloud which can travel for miles if it is released.

There have been dozens of accidents involving HF in recent years, including a devastating 2019 explosion and fire at a refinery in my district. That explosion put U.S. steelworkers and tens of thousands of nearby residents at serious risk of death and serious harm. An inspection found that the refinery lacked adequate inspection and safety protocols to prevent a catastrophe. Essentially, it was a miracle that no one died that night.

To safeguard against future accidents, I offered a commonsense amendment to this bill that would require refineries with a history of accidents or Clean Air Act violations to study alternatives to HF, but my Republican colleagues refused to allow the amendment.

This refusal to consider past disasters to create necessary safety standards tells us exactly what this bill is about: empowering the fossil fuel industry at the expense of worker and community safety.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote against this reckless bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership on this bill. The Lower Energy Costs Act is a product of countless hours of discussion between leadership, stakeholders, and our constituents, who are tired of higher costs for less reliable energy.

The United States has an incredible energy potential. We have vast resources of oil, natural gas, and other critical minerals essential for energy dominance.

Only a few years ago, we were a global leader in both oil and gas production. This was achieved through American innovation, domestic energy production, and investment from the private sector in developing our critical energy infrastructure.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration vowed to wage war on American energy. Starting on his very first day in office with the help of the Democrats here in Congress, the Biden administration has pursued radical rush-to-green energy policies that made energy less secure, less reliable, and more expensive for our constituents.

This has led to increased costs of energy and goods, hitting the most vulnerable the hardest. We should be about increasing the standard of living for Americans versus diminishing the standard of living that these anti-American energy policies actually do.

Energy is the foundation of everything in American life. When the cost of energy goes up, everything else does, as well. H.R. 1 should help America and will help America produce more, deliver more to our communities, and give us the ability to export and help our allies around the world.

The American people recognize this, and they are sick of choosing between paying their energy bills and putting food on the table, which is why they gave us the majority, to stop this radical energy agenda.

I am proud that my bill, Protecting American Energy Production Act, was included in this package. This provision will protect energy security and affordability by prohibiting the President from imposing a ban on hydraulic fracturing.

The discovery of natural gas through the shale revolution has made the United States a leader in energy production as well as emissions reduction and has allowed the United States of America, not our adversaries, to set the price of energy.

We are approaching the breaking point in our energy infrastructure. The so-called rush-to-green agenda has prevented the buildout of natural gas and other essential energy infrastructure, which is now reaching capacity. Many States, like my own State of South Carolina, are now at risk of approaching an energy deficit in the next few years if we don't immediately change our current regulatory framework.

Fortunately, H.R. 1 addresses these concerns by requiring States to raise legitimate water quality concerns for interstate pipelines and LNG export facilities through FERC's NEPA process instead of weaponizing section 401 of the Clean Water Act to block pipelines.

This change is critical to prevent the political agenda of States abusing section 401 to veto projects of national significance while preserving the ability of States to raise legitimate water quality concerns. New England States could finally get gas from the Marcellus shale instead of importing natural gas from Russia, Iran, Venezuela, and a lot of our other adversaries around the globe.

We have the resources here not only to meet our domestic demand but also to be a leading exporter globally.

Representative DEGETTE mentioned earlier about capacity and U.S. production and how that would limit available gas for American domestic energy production. The Progressive Policy Institute, which is far from a conservative think tank, put out an article, "The Climate Case for Expanding U.S. Natural Gas Exports," which talks about using that domestically. I would ask you to read it.

This package also sets a framework to export our domestic resources so our allies will no longer have to rely on Vladimir Putin's energy oligarchy. The Democrats keep calling this the polluters over people act. That couldn't be further from the truth.

The reality is that their energy policies put Russia, China, OPEC+, and radical Green New Deal interests over the interests of the American people. The greatest beneficiaries of their policies are the CCP and Vladimir Putin.

Green New Deal policies leave us totally dependent on China for critical

minerals that make all of our devices work. Even the green energy devices, wind and solar, need those critical minerals.

We have them here. We harvest them cleaner, more environmentally friendly than anywhere in the world. Let's produce them here. That is what H.R. 1 allows us to do.

H.R. 1 puts the American people first by unleashing American energy and securing our supply chains. It will increase American energy production and restore American energy leadership in the world. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership and yielding the time.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the polluters over people act, and I rushed here to the floor with some good news: This bill is not going anywhere.

President Biden has already said that he intends to veto it, but it is not even going to make it out of the U.S. Senate. I thought President Biden spoke very well in his statement on his veto message.

He said, we are "making unprecedented progress in protecting America's energy security and reducing energy costs for Americans—in their homes and at the pump. H.R. 1 would do just the opposite, replacing pro-consumer policies with a thinly veiled license to pollute. It would raise costs for American families by repealing household energy rebates and rolling back historic investments to increase access to cost-lowering clean energy technologies. Instead of protecting American consumers, it would pad oil and gas company profits—already at record levels—and undercut our public health and environment." It will take us backwards.

In fact, a number of America's leading health organizations, like the American Lung Association, the Children's Environmental Health Network, and others wrote to Congress to say they oppose H.R. 1 and its attempt to weaken the Clean Air Act to allow additional polluting energy sources. They say, "Years of scientific research has clearly established that pollution is a threat to human health at every stage of life—from inside the womb to adulthood."

Burning fossil fuels not only contributes to a warming climate, but higher levels of dangerous—and deadly—pollution.

The good news is, this bill is not going anywhere.

There is more good news for American families and all of us who care about the moral obligation we have to our kids to provide a livable planet.

Earlier this month, the International Energy Agency said it has been the

jump in renewables, not frack gas—it has been the jump in renewables that has helped blunt a feared runaway in carbon emissions. In the end, they say, global energy-related emissions are still on an unsustainable growth trajectory, but—and this is thanks to the outstanding wealth of renewable energy, electric vehicles, heat pumps, energy efficient technologies—that we still have a fighting chance.

This was followed by more good news yesterday out of the U.S. Energy Information Administration. For the first time in 2022 renewable energy in America surpassed coal burning in America, and it is now outpacing nuclear energy, as well.

Who is driving this?

I thought this was very interesting.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. The States that are producing the most renewable energy resources: In solar, California, Texas, North Carolina; in wind, again it is Texas, Iowa, and Oklahoma.

Why is this happening?

Because renewable energy is the cheapest energy.

With the Inflation Reduction Act, the bipartisan infrastructure law, the CHIPS and Science Act, we are about to lower energy bills substantially for our neighbors back home.

Since we have adopted the IRA, the infrastructure law, we have also seen \$200 billion of private sector investments in the manufacturing sector in America, in clean energy, electric vehicles, batteries, and other manufacturing processes.

There is good news here. As we debate this bill, and the polluters over people act goes nowhere, we continue to lower energy costs for our families back home, lift American workers, and provide for healthier, safer communities. We have an opportunity here to go farther and faster. That is what is inspirational today, not the backwards policies of the past.

Vote "no" on the polluters over people act.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Chair, polluters over people act. They would rather put people stopping traffic to prevent you from getting to work and people throwing mashed potatoes at art than they would the American people.

I could not disagree with my colleagues more. Oil is a global commodity. Prices went up when the President constrained supply.

How do we know that? His own actions.

What did the President do?

He went to Saudi Arabia and Venezuela to ask them to produce more oil,

and then released oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve so prices could go down just in time for the elections.

Among the 20 bills that make up this package, I draw attention to a suite of bills focused on refining and processing critical minerals as well as development of new mines for critical minerals on Federal land.

The critical minerals provisions in the E&C and Natural Resources titles are helpful for Iowa wind, which produces 58 percent of the electricity in the State. This allows Iowa to be a net exporter of electricity and supports 230 blade manufacturing jobs in Fort Madison. Ensuring we mine critical minerals in the U.S. and process those minerals domestically is critical to securing our Nation's global competitiveness and supporting many clean energy technologies as well as supporting a cleaner environment from China.

Madam Chair, I also commend the significant strides we have made on NEPA reform with the package combining measures to streamline permitting reviews for energy products and mines. Importantly, H.R. 1 places clear timelines on environmental reviews, clarifies the scope of environmental reviews, and puts sidebars on judicial reviews under NEPA.

According to a recent poll from Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions Forum, 80 percent of people support policies that expedite government review of infrastructure projects, which is why these issues are at the heart of H.R. 1. As fiscal conservatives, we also take pride in the fact that responsible permitting reform has the opportunity to lower emissions while also costing zero taxpayer dollars and lowering the costs of energy for consumers.

I am proud of the legislative wins in H.R. 1 to reduce energy costs. We all want a cleaner, healthier planet for our children and grandchildren and also affordable, abundant energy. H.R. 1 is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

□ 1315

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Chair, I rise today to share my disappointment and to oppose H.R. 1.

As a Representative of California, I work to find solutions that deal with price spikes at the pump, bring down high heating bills, and deliver lower costs overall to my constituents.

You can imagine my optimism when I first saw on our agenda a bill that supposedly aims at lowering energy costs.

When I read it, I was shocked to see that the only lower thing that it does is lower standards for our Nation's polluters.

This bill doesn't deliver less cost to families. It only forces more giveaways of our public lands to Big Oil, the same oil companies that already have thousands of unused drilling permits.

This bill doesn't decrease energy prices. It increases the number of loopholes in our public health laws.

This bill just doesn't fail to help families bring their utility bills down. It actually repeals solutions that we put in place last year to bring down heating costs and to help folks upgrade to more efficient home energy appliances.

Higher levels of pollution, higher costs for families, and, let's not forget, higher budget deficits to the tune of \$2.4 billion over the next decade—is that being fiscally responsible?

Madam Chair, putting polluters ahead of people is bad enough, but actually raising energy costs and our Federal deficit while proclaiming to care about this is even worse.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so we can actually work together to build on the laws we have passed that promote clean energy, cut energy costs for families across the country, and reduce the deficit.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, legislation offered by our majority leader that will fulfill House Republicans' commitment to America and focuses on one of the most pressing issues facing communities in Ohio and across the country.

Over the past 2 years, I have heard from countless people in Ohio's Fifth District that the soaring cost of energy has negatively impacted family budgeting, business operations, and agricultural output.

One retired individual told me that his gas budget plan went from \$100 a month to \$160.

Farmers in my district were hit hard because of the need to fuel their farm equipment and purchase fertilizer and other materials made from petroleum products. In 2022, operating costs for ag producers went up a whopping 30 percent. This resulted in higher food and grocery costs for consumers, eating up a larger share of the family budget.

There is no way around it: Energy plays a huge role in America's economy. Plants in northern Ohio, such as glass, steel, and food processing, depend on reliable and affordable energy.

When I asked stakeholders at a recent Energy and Commerce roundtable whether we need more or less power in the future to meet demand, it was unanimous. Our economic future depends on the generation of more power, not less.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration's policy of restricting access to and production of energy resulted in higher costs.

After promising throughout 2020 that he was going to shut down American energy production, President Biden came into office and immediately canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, which would have carried 830,000 barrels per

day from Canada. This ill-conceived order also eliminated good-paying American jobs.

He then halted new oil and gas leases on Federal lands, slowed or halted the permitting process for new oil and gas projects, and authorized financial regulators to issue new rules to make it harder to invest in the oil and gas industry.

Instead of recognizing that his failed policies were causing prices to increase, the administration called on countries like Russia, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and other OPEC nations for relief and authorized historic releases from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to manipulate the markets.

To the surprise of no one, all of these gimmicks failed, and the American people have paid the price. That ends today.

H.R. 1 represents the culmination of our early efforts to solve the problem of lowering energy costs. It will increase domestic energy production, reform restrictive and costly permitting processes, reverse the Biden administration's anti-American energy policies, and boost the processing and production of critical minerals.

This legislation also includes my bill, the REFINER Act, to boost refining capacity in the United States. In order to meet the energy demands of the American people, we need more refining infrastructure to transform products into fuel and other petroleum products.

We also need increased capacity to keep the prices of everyday goods down, like medicine, hygiene products, clothing, home improvement products, and more.

The REFINERY Act will provide us with the much-needed blueprint to do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Chair, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here today, I believe we need an all-of-the-above energy approach in this country.

As a Member of Congress representing a district that is 65 percent covered in corn and soybeans every single summer, that all-of-the-above approach includes strong support for biofuels.

When prices at the gas pump were rising last year, I worked across the aisle to pass legislation allowing for the year-round sales of E15 through this House. This was the first time a bill like this passed this body.

Renewable fuels like E15 are made with a higher ethanol blend than regular gasoline and can sell for up to 40 cents less per gallon in Minnesota.

Investments in E15 and biofuels mean new markets for our family farmers growing corn and soybeans in my district, and it means giving our domestic energy supply security and reinforcement as we work to increase U.S. energy independence.

I am proud to have worked last summer to pass the largest investment in biofuels in our Nation's history through the Inflation Reduction Act.

This is a game changer for corn growers and soybean farmers in my district, and it is a commonsense way to help protect our environment, strengthen our energy independence, and lower costs for Americans.

The Inflation Reduction Act included many more investments in renewable energy and important reforms to our oil and gas leasing practices.

Today, House Republicans are putting forth hyperpartisan legislation to roll back the climate progress we made in the last Congress, gutting clean air and drinking water protections and giving handouts to polluters.

Their so-called all-of-the-above energy bill does not contain even a discussion of biofuels. There were amendments offered by my colleague in Iowa to include biofuels in this legislation. Republicans blocked them.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Chair, it is one thing to say you support an all-of-the-above energy approach. It is entirely another thing to actually do it.

I will work with anyone to lower costs for my constituents and to support Minnesota farmers, but this bill is a handout to Big Oil and a slap in the face to family farmers.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, let me just say it is great to see the American people in the gallery for once listening to a debate on energy. It is so important to them.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded not to reference occupants of the gallery.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, which will reinsert America back to its proper place as the world's leader in energy and critical mineral production.

My home State of Idaho is blessed to be rich in natural resources, especially when it comes to critical minerals. Right now, there are revolutionary innovations in technology industries, transportation, and healthcare, and they all have one thing in common: an increasing need for certain critical minerals.

Idaho contains an abundance of these minerals, including cobalt, lithium, and antimony. These resources not only can help the United States meet domestic demand, but they can also help fulfill global demand and bring prosperity to communities lacking high-paying jobs.

As part of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I voted for many of these provisions in H.R. 1 that support access to critical minerals in American soil and require the Department of Energy

to identify resources vulnerable to supply chain disruptions.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has proliferated policies that have ceded America's place as a responsible, productive source of critical minerals to foreign nations, many of which are hostile to Americans.

For example, instead of Idaho and America producing the world's antimony, China and Russia account for more than 75 percent of the world's supply. Instead of Idaho and America fulfilling the global demand for cobalt, it comes from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a country with a horrifically bad human rights record. That has to change.

Madam Chair, today, we offer Americans an all-of-the-above energy strategy that will reverse the America last policies currently in place. H.R. 1 will secure domestic energy supply and allow America to control its own destiny by restoring its position as a global leader in production.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a member of our committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

I am upset that the Republicans have brought forth this bill, which sells out the health and well-being of the American people.

For decades, scientists have warned of the devastating impacts that human-caused climate change will have and do have on our planet. Consider even the first 3 months of this year.

In January, Alabama and Georgia were hit by severe storms, straight-line winds, and tornadoes that caused at least nine storm-related deaths.

In January and March, my home State of California experienced severe winter storms, flooding, and mudslides that ended in at least 27 storm-related deaths across the State combined.

Just last week in Mississippi, there was devastation by severe storms and tornadoes that resulted in 26 people dying.

H.R. 1 fast-tracks offshore oil and gas developments, guts bedrock environmental and public health laws, silences communities, and reverses the significant progress that we made through the Inflation Reduction Act.

These are your Republican Representatives bringing forth this bill. They are selling out the American people for oil profits.

Last Congress, Republicans had the choice to join Democrats as we worked to deliver a historic \$369 billion in climate action and clean energy investments through the Inflation Reduction Act. Instead, they have chosen to advance bills like this that, if implemented, will worsen the climate crisis and put our children and grandchildren on a path to an unlivable future.

Madam Chair, this bill chooses to put polluters over people, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I am glad the people at home are watching this on TV or here in person because they are learning that H.R. 1 is going to lower their energy costs.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and whose State is a huge energy producer for our Nation.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this bill is absolutely critical to our Nation, critical for hardworking Americans, not to mention critical for national security.

We produce energy cleaner, more efficiently, and cheaper than any other country. We need to start acting like it.

The best way to reverse the damage of Biden's energy crisis and drive down energy prices is by flipping the switch and unleashing American energy at home.

We have real solutions in H.R. 1 to do just that very thing.

Bills like Representative CRENSHAW's Keeping America's Refineries Act will help ensure that our Nation's refineries can continue to operate and keep the lights on in our country.

My energy-heavy district, as the chairman referred to, houses about 50 percent of Texas' daily refining output. Our district is home to America's largest petroleum refineries, which process 2.6 million barrels of oil a day. This bill will ensure our refineries stay online.

This bill fights back on overburdensome regulations imposed by the Biden administration that target the use of hydrofluoric acid that goes into everything from aluminum cans to vehicle fuel cells.

Our country simply cannot run without energy, and let me tell you: We can't afford to live in the greenies' dystopia that the folks on the other side of the aisle dream about, either.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this vital piece of legislation that will unleash American energy, lower energy costs for hardworking Americans, increase production, reform the drawn-out permitting processes, streamline energy infrastructure, and boost the production and processing of critical minerals. Our country depends on it.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), who is the ranking member of our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Chair, I rise today to reaffirm my commitment and that of my Democratic colleagues to reducing energy costs for the American people.

Last Congress, we delivered a historic bill, the Inflation Reduction Act, that will save Americans money and make transformative investments to fight climate change.

The High-Efficiency Electric Home Rebate Program, in particular, gives Americans up to \$14,000 to electrify their homes and improve energy efficiency. It covers up to 100 percent of electrification project costs for low-income households, who often bear the brunt of both high-energy costs and extreme weather.

I know this program will save lives and money because the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, or as we call it SMUD, is doing this in my district. Last November, I visited a constituent, a retired nurse whose home had been fully electrified and weatherized by SMUD. This includes a heat pump, water heater, induction stove, ceiling fans, energy-efficient refrigerator, and insulation.

The Inflation Reduction Act would allow SMUD to significantly expand this program, which would positively impact my constituents.

H.R. 1 would repeal the home rebate program. This legislation would repeal a program that could save Americans up to \$14,000. This is nothing more than a shameless giveaway to Big Oil when we need to be accelerating the clean energy transition.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), a new member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 1.

With this bill, the days of America's dependence on imported energy are beginning to come to a close.

Under President Biden, gas prices have skyrocketed, leases for oil and gas have been canceled, and electricity prices have soared.

Thankfully, multiple committees have come together to provide a multi-lateral solution to these problems.

When H.R. 1 becomes law, it will lower energy costs and unleash American energy, providing clarity for critical infrastructure investors.

It will streamline energy permitting and exports and repeal the new natural gas tax imposed by the Biden administration.

House Republicans are delivering on our promise to reestablish the days of American energy independence.

Importantly, H.R. 1 slashes burdensome regulations that make it difficult and unappealing to build in America.

Eliminating these barriers in conjunction with comprehensive permitting reform will reverse the Biden administration's radical energy policies that destroyed American dominance in the energy space and compromised our national security.

Simply put, H.R. 1 will unleash American innovation and unlock American resources for future generations.

I look forward to voting “yea” on H.R. 1, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1. My community of Buffalo and Niagara Falls are all too familiar with the devastating consequences of decisions that put polluters over people.

Toxic waste dumped by Hooker Chemical in the 1940s contaminated the Love Canal neighborhood of Niagara Falls. President Jimmy Carter declared a Federal health emergency, and Congress passed the Superfund Act with Love Canal becoming the first cleanup site.

In 1968, the Buffalo River caught fire due to industrial contamination and was considered biologically dead.

Atrocities like this led to the approval of the Clean Water Act in 1972 and have required hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

After residents sounded the alarm for years, in 2013, Tonawanda Coke was found guilty of deliberately releasing cancer-causing benzene into surrounding neighborhoods, a violation of the Clean Air Act.

The Superfund Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act were each put in place after historically unchecked pollution impacted the health of our waterways, communities, and families.

H.R. 1 removes safety protections, lessens accountability for violators, and diminishes public input.

If this bill were in place 10 years ago, western New York neighbors would have had no recourse to address the carcinogens and toxic substances released into the air by Tonawanda Coke.

We can't let polluting history repeat itself.

I am voting “no” on H.R. 1 and encourage my colleagues who care about the health and future of our communities to do the same.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I am glad we have got so many members of the Energy and Commerce Committee to come down and show the American people how we are going to lower their energy costs.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a real leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, here is the deal: It is January 19, 2021. Gas is \$2.38 per gallon. We had just replenished our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. American energy dominance provided stability across the geopolitical landscape.

The following day, the war on domestic energy began with the cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline and executive action restricting domestic production.

In a matter of mere months, gas prices would reach record highs. Our emergency reserves would be tapped for political purposes, and we would be begging adversaries to increase their

production while an empowered Russia and an empowered China both eyed territorial expansion.

This is what the radical Green New Deal looks like in implementation.

My constituents have told me about the energy bills that they can't budget for, the unaffordable rate spikes in peak hours, and even stories of gas tanks being drilled into.

Everything costs more when energy costs more.

With H.R. 1, energy will cost less.

The Lower Energy Costs Act will unleash domestic production. H.R. 1 includes permitting reforms, increased production and processing of critical minerals, and an undoing of the Biden administration's regulatory stranglehold on the energy sector.

In Michigan, activists have long eyed shutting down Line 5, an essential international pipeline sustaining 34,000 jobs across the Midwest and billions in economic activity.

Language I authored, included in H.R. 1, would protect these pipelines from being unilaterally shut down by an overzealous executive branch.

Prosperity, opportunity, and security are on the line.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. SALINAS).

Ms. SALINAS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Vladimir Putin's war on Ukraine demonstrated that the clean energy transition isn't just important for our planet, it is important for our national security.

It revealed the dangerous pitfalls of our overreliance on global oil and gas markets. The solution is not to deepen our reliance on fossil fuels, it is to go all in on clean, American energy. We need to ramp up solar, wind, hydrogen, and other similar projects across the country. Oregon is poised for this type of investment in development.

However, H.R. 1 doesn't do that. Instead, it repeals major clean energy programs, even going so far as to target the home electrification rebate designed to help American families make their homes energy efficient, yet another petty, retributive action by House Republicans.

This bill worsens the climate crisis and hampers our ability to produce clean energy here at home. It is a disaster in the making.

I also want to talk more specifically about my community back home. Oregon's Sixth District is home to hundreds of specialty crop farmers who grow everything from blueberries to wine grapes and hazelnuts. The farming tradition in the Willamette Valley dates back centuries. It was even publicized in the 1820s as a “promised land of flowing milk and honey.”

Today, this land faces a serious threat. Specialty crop growers in my district recognize the imminent danger the climate crisis poses to their farming tradition. Many are already feeling

the impacts of our warming planet as extreme drought, heat waves, and wildfires diminish crop yields and endanger farmers' livelihoods.

H.R. 1 would exacerbate the climate crisis, and further threaten Oregon's future. This bill would repeal key clean energy programs in favor of unmitigated fossil fuel production, leading to more emissions and harmful climate impacts.

For all these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, the rush to disaster is this rush to green energy policies without thinking about the replacement source of power generation that can be provided by American-produced natural gas, delivered to where it needs to be to produce the power and help lower carbon emissions for America.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act because lowering energy costs is a top priority of Tennesseans.

Since President Biden took office, energy costs have skyrocketed. To make matters worse, congressional Democrats poured gasoline on the fire by passing a \$370 billion Green New Deal giveaway that has done nothing to address the root cause of record-high energy costs and inflation.

My neighbors often ask, Why have energy costs gone up so much, so quickly? Why is the President not doing anything about it? Unfortunately, the Biden administration prioritizes the demands of woke, left-wing activists that would rather hold our economy hostage than promote the cleanest, most affordable energy produced right here in the United States.

Madam Chair, because of the reckless policies of the Biden administration, Republicans have many priorities this Congress, but our number one priority is to lower energy costs on behalf of the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose the polluters over people act and the mining provisions that will make it easier for foreign-owned companies to pollute our lands and waters and destroy our Tribal cultural resources.

America's 150-year-old mining law already fails to protect our communities from irresponsible mining. We see that in the thousands of abandoned mines that dot New Mexico and the West.

H.R. 1 would only make it worse, threatening our water and, as we know, "agua es vida," "water is life."

I am disappointed that the Republicans blocked my amendment to stop mining exploration on public lands if it harms our water, farmers, and Tribal communities. Do they not care about our most essential resource, our water?

Indeed, some proposed mining projects are from subsidiaries of for-

eign companies like Resolution Copper in Arizona, which has ties to the Chinese Communist Party. Why are they protecting the Chinese Communist Party's subsidiary mining our precious resources?

That mine would devastate Tribal cultural resources and threaten our precious water resources.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this polluter over people act.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Chair, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1. This administration, the Biden administration, has stonewalled American energy production, quite literally, from day one.

The permit for the Keystone XL pipeline was revoked just hours after Biden's inauguration, and permitting for new oil and gas leases were halted soon thereafter.

The results were predictable. Americans endured historically high gas prices, with Floridians paying, on average, \$4.80 per gallon last summer. Government restriction and regulation fanned the flames of inflation already burdening Floridians and Americans at gas pumps and grocery stores.

□ 1345

We, as Republicans, have a responsibility to uphold our Commitment to America. H.R. 1 will be the cornerstone of fulfilling that commitment to our friends and neighbors in Florida's Third District.

We will start by overhauling our permitting regulations. This administration has effectively frozen all new oil and gas exploration permits, severely handicapping our ability to fulfill the energy demands of Americans.

We can choose to rely on energy imports from hostile nations and fair-weather friends, or we can utilize the vast potential of our energy sector to meet our needs more efficiently and cleanly.

Our energy requirements extend to nearly all of our most vital industries, arguably none more important than our agricultural sector, because a nation that cannot feed itself cannot be safe. Essential inputs, from fertilizer to gasoline for tractors, are directly reliant on the price of energy. Unleashing the power of our energy will keep the costs of businesses low for our producers and prices low at the grocery store, benefiting all Americans.

Repealing export restrictions on LNG, liquefied natural gas, will exponentially grow our share of global gas markets. The largest LNG bunker barge, the Clean Canaveral, just completed its inaugural bunkering in Jacksonville, Florida, making the Sunshine State a new hub for natural gas. Floridians stand to benefit greatly in jobs

and economic growth from the reduction of regulations and LNG exports.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Environmental protection and smart regulation, alongside responsible businesses and every single one of us, will save our planet for the next generation, for my four grandchildren, and for your grandchildren.

When my granddaughter, Aubrey, was only 5 years old, she attended an issues conference with a national candidate who asked Aubrey what she cared about. Aubrey responded, "Trash on the playground. How do we fix that?" a simple yet important question.

One of our most basic jobs is to protect our natural resources, protect this global playground, and regulate companies to ensure that they are not able to abuse and pollute our planet.

The deregulation that H.R. 1 allows will pollute our planet and harm health. This legislation guts critical investments in climate change, balloons the deficit, and rolls back key environmental standards, all while failing to address energy costs for Pennsylvania's families.

They are trying to do this at the same time we are seeing some consequences of deregulation right in Pennsylvania, leading to environmental disasters that could poison American families, like the derailment of the train and environmental disaster in East Palestine, Ohio, affecting, of course, Pennsylvania's Pittsburgh suburbs, and, most recently, the pollution of water in Philadelphia.

It seems we need more regulation, not less.

Madam Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle either forget or simply do not know that it was a Republican President, Richard Nixon, who, in 1970, proposed the Environmental Protection Agency, and it began operation that same year.

In the early 1970s, Pennsylvania passed a brilliant constitutional amendment, article I, section 27, which says Pennsylvanians are guaranteed the right to clean air and clean water and to the protection of our natural aesthetics for generations to come. This beautiful amendment is a reminder to all of us that we should not pass H.R. 1.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, it is funny. I see polluters over people act. We are talking about increasing natural gas production and delivery in this country. According to EIA data, switching to natural gas has accounted for as much as 61 percent of U.S. emissions reductions from 2005 to 2020.

More natural gas—cleaner burning, American-produced natural gas—delivered to where it needs to go will help

us lower carbon emissions and make America more energy secure.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chair, I stand here before you today because the American people are hurting. Over the past few years, they have been forced to cope with skyrocketing costs, a direct result of President Biden's misguided energy policies.

With every step the President has taken to restrict domestic energy, from canceling the Keystone pipeline to placing a ban on new drilling, it has become much harder for Americans to make ends meet. Fortunately, Republicans have a solution to this problem that will increase domestic energy production.

The United States is home to some of the largest reserves of oil and natural gas anywhere in the world. The Lower Energy Costs Act will allow us to tap into these resources so we can drive down the cost of energy and combat the out-of-control inflation that has devastated the American family.

Our legislation will increase American energy production, reform our broken permitting process, reverse President Biden's anti-energy policies, and improve the construction of energy infrastructure.

H.R. 1 also protects our energy future by boosting production of critical minerals, making us less reliant on our adversaries such as China.

Under the leadership of Chair RODGERS, my colleagues and I on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been working to shape policies that will unleash American energy and lower costs for our families. H.R. 1 represents our commitment to fighting for an economy that is strong and a nation that is safe.

This bill will help reduce our reliance on foreign oil, which would not only benefit our economy but also strengthen our national security and our safety.

The left's dream of a Green New Deal future has turned into a nightmare, and it is time for the President to wake up. With prices nearing record highs, the need to unleash American energy has never been more pressing and important.

This body must take immediate action to lower energy costs, fight inflation, and secure our energy future, and this bill will do it.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

This bill is nothing more than a shameless handout to fossil fuel companies, and it speaks volumes that House Republicans have made it their number one priority for the 118th Congress.

My colleagues across the aisle have once again chosen to side with their Big Oil buddies and stand against the American people, our planet, and our future.

Let me be clear: The last thing that Big Oil needs is another handout. Last year, we all felt pain at the pump while fossil fuel companies raked in record profits. When House Democrats voted to crack down on gas price gouging, Republicans voted "no."

With their new majority and this bill, Republicans are letting us know exactly where their loyalties lie and the lows that they will sink to in order to appease those special interests. They are even giving polluters free rein to dump toxic waste on our public lands.

The Republican Party has made it clear that they are happy to poison our planet if it helps their fossil fuel friends make a quick buck.

Under the polluters over people act, working families will pay the price, literally. Through taxpayer-funded subsidies and reckless deregulation, Republicans are rewarding Big Oil for bad behavior, and this time, they are not even hiding it.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to please oppose this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), whose State is at the crossroads of America.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Only a few years ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs with our own production. Under President Biden's reckless energy agenda, however, we have dramatically increased our dependence on foreign oil, sent gas prices sky-high last year, and increased the cost of energy bills for Americans and the people in Indiana who I represent.

House Republicans made a commitment to America that we would end the war on American energy, and we are demonstrating that commitment today by passing H.R. 1.

This bill will flip the switch on domestic energy production, reversing the administration's anti-energy policies and streamlining our energy infrastructure.

Included in this bill is my Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, which would address the broad set of critical energy resources that we need to properly assess our Nation's energy supply, identify critical resources for our economy, and help locate vulnerabilities in our supply chains.

Under this legislation, the U.S. could produce energy that is cleaner and safer than other parts of the world—which we already are—where production is tied to dangerous working conditions, child labor exploitation, and extremely low pay.

It would also help us shift away from our reliance on energy resources from

countries controlled by foreign dictators, better protecting our national security.

As a supporter of an all-of-the-above energy approach, I know how crucial it is that we take steps to safeguard and secure the energy resources necessary to keep the lights on, rates down, and emissions low.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1 so that we can address America's energy crisis created by the administration and meet America's energy needs on our own.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), a member of our committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding and recognizing me.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' energy bill.

I have deep concerns about this package overall in terms of its attack on our bedrock environmental laws. As a Marylander, I am particularly alarmed at changes to section 401 certifications under the Clean Water Act, which would endanger the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

To protect our environment and public health, States need to have the authority and tools to regulate pollution in their waters. One section of this bill would narrow States' ability to regulate pollution sources that impact downstream water quality.

This bill would also restrict the conditions and limitations that a State could place on clean water certification, further hampering a State's means of protecting its waters.

That has grave implications for a State's ability to set limits on how much of a particular pollutant a water body can accept while still meeting the State's overall water quality standards. These limits, known as total maximum daily loads, or TMDLs, are required to restore waters impaired by pollution, which is the case for the Chesapeake Bay and most of its tributaries.

That is why I filed an amendment, along with Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, to ensure that this energy bill would not impact a State's authority to establish or implement a State-approved TMDL for an impaired waterway. Unfortunately, Republicans did not allow for this amendment to be offered on the floor today.

As this bill strips away environmental and public health protections across the board, we don't even have the most basic assurances that States will be able to design and execute their own plans to reduce waterway pollution.

For the Chesapeake Bay, this could be disastrous. The TMDLs are the guides by which the seven watershed jurisdictions work with EPA to continue making progress on the larger Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

It is gross negligence, as a matter of legislation, to roll back these key protections for these bodies of water.

Tragically, rolling back these protections is the chief goal of this bill. That is what it is all about. For that reason, I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), whose State includes the Marcellus shale, which has an immeasurable amount of natural gas.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Chair, the increased cost of energy over the last couple of years under the Biden administration has put tremendous strains on small businesses, families, and my neighbors across Pennsylvania and across our country.

My district does encompass a good portion of the Marcellus shale, one of the highest natural gas producing regions, in fact, in the world.

Energy is jobs. Energy is good pay. Natural gas is about education. The schools that are developing throughout my communities in order to enrich young people for the future and have them stay in Pennsylvania is so incredibly meaningful, Madam Chair.

Natural gas, Madam Chair, is one of the cleanest energies known to man. A tripling, it is known, of the use of natural gas will enormously reduce carbon emissions on a worldwide perspective. There is so much good about this. Natural gas is an answer to any transitional carbon-free emissions.

Madam Chair, this administration has been doing everything it can to assault domestic energy and is truly choosing Venezuela over Pennsylvania and OPEC over Texas, and the list can go on.

□ 1400

This is senseless. H.R. 1 corrects a lot of this. H.R. 1 is about energy independence, which improves our national security. It is about less carbon emissions because we do create the cleanest energy in the world. H.R. 1 is about strengthening America, Madam Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SORESEN).

Mr. SORESEN. Madam Chair, as Congress' only meteorologist, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, House Republicans' polluters over people act.

This bill does nothing to lower energy costs for working families. This bill does nothing to help our farm families dealing with the effects of extreme weather. This bill does nothing to support the domestic production of biofuels in central and northwestern Illinois.

In fact, instead of lowering costs for working communities across the Nation, the polluters over people act pads the pockets of Big Oil and Gas, guts environmental protections, and adds \$2.4 billion to the deficit.

Earlier this week, I offered an amendment that would have prevented big corporations from selling natural gas overseas until we could ensure that

it won't raise prices here at home. I am disappointed that Republicans put polluters over people and blocked my amendment from being considered today.

At home in Illinois, sustainability is not a partisan issue. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all want our communities to be clean and prosperous. I thought this would be a bipartisan goal in Congress, but it seems that my colleagues across the aisle are willing to let the Federal deficit balloon for Big Oil and corporate interests at the expense of our communities' futures.

Not only will this decision impact our daily lives; it impacts the lives of our children, grandchildren, and their grandchildren.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on commonsense solutions that meet our Nation's energy needs while lowering energy costs for working families. American families deserve much more.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, exporting U.S.-produced, cleaner-burning natural gas to places like Vietnam and China, which allows them to take their coal-fired power plants offline, actually lowers carbon emissions globally.

Democrats say they care about carbon emissions globally. Exporting clean-burning natural gas will help do that.

Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. I am proud of the work that we are doing here to reduce the burden of high energy costs facing Americans and to strengthen our national security. I am also pleased that my bill to repeal the EPA's \$27 billion slush fund is included in H.R. 1. It is an important step to right the numerous wrongs in the misnamed Inflation Reduction Act.

I have said many times that the war in Ukraine didn't create the energy crisis; it exposed it. If we learn nothing else from the energy crisis in Europe, it is that we should never make our Nation or our allies dependent on an adversarial nation to meet our energy needs. Sadly, the Biden administration's attacks on American hydrocarbon energy make us more dependent on China, who is an adversary, making this not only an economic security issue but a national security issue, as well. Thankfully, the Lower Energy Costs Act puts us on a path to energy security, improves our economy, and strengthens our national security.

Additionally, Americans have been facing record levels of inflation due to the policies of the Biden administration. Energy costs are one of the biggest drivers of inflation. Everything we use or consume has an energy cost. On day one, President Biden set the course for higher energy costs and higher inflation. When he came into office, inflation was 1.87 percent. Today, it is over 6.5 percent because of reckless

spending, increases in massive regulatory costs, and higher energy costs.

The misnamed Inflation Reduction Act contributed to these problems by establishing the so-called Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which is nothing more than a \$27 billion slush fund for green advocacy groups.

The reality is energy prices have risen so much during Joe Biden's Presidency that nearly 20 million households are now behind on their household utility bills. If my colleagues really wanted to help the American people, they would do everything they could to help reduce energy costs.

This might be interesting to my colleagues. Polling indicates that a majority of voters support the Lower Energy Costs Act, including 56 percent of self-identified liberals and 69 percent of moderates.

For these reasons, I encourage all of my colleagues to support unleashing our domestic energy production to reduce the cost of living for all Americans, strengthens our national security, and makes energy independent again. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today because the Republicans' so-called energy legislation is a farce. This bill does nothing to lower energy costs. It instead increases our deficit by \$2.4 billion in handouts to Big Oil.

In Ways and Means, the Oversight Committee clearly presented a report last year that clearly showed the oil companies themselves lied. Not Biden but the oil companies raised the price beyond belief.

I tried to offer a simple amendment to this bill that expressed support for offshore wind development, a clean energy source. That is it. It was blocked. At the same time, an amendment on their side was added, which gives hot air to fictions about offshore wind. So much for regular order.

Let me be clear, the experts agree. NOAA agrees, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the experts agree that offshore wind is not harmful to marine life. They would support it.

The author of one of these amendments was once a big supporter of wind energy. Now, he is leading the misinformation campaign against offshore wind.

How do you like that?

Republicans don't listen to experts or science. We know that. Their attacks on clean energy are rooted in pure bad faith.

Wind power is clean energy. It supports good-paying, union manufacturing and construction jobs.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I applaud leadership for allowing this bill to go through regular order. It went through three committees, 21 bills, hearings, markups, amendments offered, and here we are today.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), who is from a huge area of Marcellus shale, producing so much natural gas for our Nation.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, for the past 2 years, President Biden has made it his top priority to wage war on American energy.

On his first day in office, President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline and sent a message for those who wished to produce energy here in the United States that they would not be welcomed during his tenure.

When gas prices soared to over \$5 a gallon in Pennsylvania last summer, his administration continued to tout the benefits of the Green New Deal, instead of working to lower prices for American families.

Now, House Republicans are finally putting an end to Biden's failed policies. H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, would create the permitting reform that is required in order to allow American companies to produce the oil, natural gas, and critical minerals that we so desperately need.

Included in this bill is legislation that I crafted to provide critical energy resource facilities the ability to participate in the EPA's flexible air permitting program and providing them with the ability to anticipate operational changes.

This isn't about cutting regulations. It is about giving certainty to American energy producers. This legislation allows us to provide the flexibility that American businesses need to mine and produce critical materials safely while at the same time spurring investments into our own communities.

It was President Reagan who said: We maintain peace through our strength.

Today, that means returning to American energy dominance and ending our reliance on foreign oil. It is time to streamline the permitting process, it is time to lower energy prices, and it is time to create American jobs.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

You know what? We hoped, coming from an energy State, that we could do this bipartisan. H.R. 1 goes off on a tangent that even union members are questioning.

If you want to know what the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers would like, they would like us to be bipartisan and to get a framework to strengthen and to get reliable Federal permitting so that we can continue to have jobs.

Even those who believe in parks, like I do, would like a permitting process that works and protects our parks. But if we look at this, what we will be

doing is just giving people a blank slip, and they can do whatever they want to do in America's precious parks. That is not where we want to be.

I am grateful for the idea that we want to build our economy, but we cannot build our economy on environmental disasters which are happening around the Nation: the 2008 coal ash spill in Tennessee, the 2014 water crisis in Flint, the concealed 2022 radioactive spill in Minnesota, the tragedy with the tornado in Mississippi, and the train chemical spill and fire in Ohio.

It is clear that we need to do something together, but this is not it. H.R. 1 will, in fact, impact our environment by taking away the requirements for waste produced by certain energy facilities. It will undermine the Toxic Substances Control Act by short-circuiting the review and approval process for new chemicals. It will also allow the EPA administrator to circumvent the scientific process of approving or denying flexible permitting. That is not what our workers want us to do.

In addition, we find that the Federal Government recognizes that this is not working. In his statement to veto, the President acknowledges that this would raise costs for American families by repealing household energy rebates, roll back historic investments to increase access to low-cost energy. Instead of protecting American consumers, it would pad and increase profits by those who already have profits.

What about our health?

What about our children?

H.R. 1 is not bipartisan. It needs to be a compromise, working with all of us to create jobs.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEUSER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired, and the gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, the problem of increasing energy costs is a critically important issue for my constituents. Many of the members of my community are paying natural gas prices over twice as high as they were a year ago, and they count themselves lucky, because some of the people in my district have natural gas bills three times higher to heat their homes than they were a year ago. Also, gasoline prices in my district are almost twice as high as they were just a few years ago.

Mr. Chair, I represent over 100,000 people who commute over an hour, each way, back and forth to Los Angeles every day. They are not doing this because they want to. They are doing this because that is what is required to put food on the table for their families. They can't afford to buy a new car, much less an electric car. Every time the price of energy goes up, these people feel the effects the most acutely.

This is not unique to my district. In fact, a survey released several weeks ago showed that over 30 percent of Americans had to make the incredibly difficult decision between paying a higher energy bill or buying basic necessities for their family in the last 12 months.

This bill is a meaningful step toward improving that situation. It would streamline the production of energy here in America.

□ 1415

Mr. Chair, the problem we have here is a classic one of supply and demand. Unfortunately, at both the Federal and State levels, we have actively sought to constrain the supply of domestic energy here in America over the last several years.

Economists will tell you that when you do that, when you have a fixed demand and you constrain the supply, prices have to go up. That is exactly what has been happening, and it is disproportionately impacting the segment of our population who can least afford to pay it.

Mr. Chair, we produce energy more cleanly in America than anywhere else on the planet. When we force our constituents to import a barrel of oil from Venezuela, it has a 50 percent higher life cycle greenhouse gas emission than a barrel of oil produced here. This bill will meaningfully improve that situation.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

Besides increasing the deficit by \$2.4 billion, this bill eviscerates bedrock environmental protections.

These protections are in place for a reason. My community has been stifled by decades of environmental abuses, and as a result, economic growth in many areas is a challenge and the health and safety of my constituents are at risk.

My district was once a thriving manufacturing community, but factories dumped waste in rivers, buried toxic materials, and disposed of materials with no oversight. Now my district is littered with abandoned factories, fragile ecosystems, and unusable land.

Sites once used for industrial, manufacturing, or commercial uses have been abandoned or underutilized due to known or suspected contamination of the past.

Environmental liabilities have been preventing developers and investors from restoring these properties to productive use and revitalizing impacted communities.

During my time in Congress, I have fought to bring back millions of dollars to my district for brownfield remediation in places like Waterbury, New Britain, and Torrington. Places where asthma-related illnesses are on the rise

as a direct result of environmental factors.

We are working to clean decades of pollution in the rivers of the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Farmington valleys. These once-blighted properties have been transformed into fisheries, art spaces, and even affordable housing.

After years of hard work, we were able to secure wild and scenic designations for miles of rivers in Connecticut. My State is literally beginning to breathe again.

This legislation rolls back environmental protections and regulations and gives billions in handouts to Big Oil and Gas.

In Connecticut's Fifth, we are learning hard lessons about cleaning up environmental messes of the past.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous and harmful legislation, and for us to listen to the science and follow what we already know to be true.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), who is a new member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and whose State has the Marcellus shale. They are a big producer in oil, coal, hydro, nuclear, and a lot of other things.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The American people deserve reliable, secure, and affordable energy to power our homes and businesses, fuel our vehicles, and sustain our way of life.

In this country we are blessed with an abundance of clean and affordable energy resources capable of meeting our energy needs for many generations to come.

Today, we have an opportunity to end our reliance on bad actors, lower prices for families hurting under sky-high inflation, and finally unleashing American energy dominance.

H.R. 1 is about ensuring a secure energy future for America.

Just recently, PJM Interconnection, one of the Nation's largest grid operators, released an alarming report about the long-term reliability of America's power grid.

The report shows that America's growing power demand, coupled with the retirement of existing power generation, far outweighs renewable sources' capacity to keep up.

Simply put, the Biden administration's rush to green is putting us on a dangerous collision course toward power outages and energy insecurity.

To see the consequences of the rush to green, just take a look at the energy crisis that unfolded when much of Europe shut off nuclear and fossil fuel power generation without a means to meet their power needs.

We cannot allow ourselves to fall victim to the same fate.

H.R. 1 embraces the abundant resources at our disposal and rejects the false notion that a cleaner environ-

ment can only be achieved at the peril of the United States' energy security and independence.

This commonsense bill reforms the outdated permitting process, increases domestic energy production, and repeals President Biden's disastrous natural gas tax.

Mr. Chair, when the American people flip on the light switch, they should have confidence that the lights will actually come on.

I am proud to join my colleagues in delivering on our commitment to America by restoring American energy dominance.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting America's energy future with the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, this week my Republican colleagues are fast-tracking a bill that puts polluters over people, H.R. 1.

Let's be clear: This bill won't do anything, not one thing to help American consumers and families to lower their energy costs. Yes, we do want that light on, but this bill is not going to help us get there.

Instead, it would simply repeal household energy rebates passed by House Democrats, like those from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

We shouldn't have to choose between dirty air and polluted water just to meet the energy needs of the future. We simply don't have to. We could work together in a bipartisan way to address energy costs, but extreme MAGA Republicans refuse to do that.

We could work together on issues like the electrical grid liability and security, an issue that is all too important to us in my home State of Texas.

Instead, Republican-backed H.R. 1 picks winners and losers. The wealthy and well-connected win and workers lose. I stand with workers. Workers in my district know that new energy jobs and clean energy jobs are the jobs of the future. We depend on them.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill because this bill does not protect those workers. I urge my colleagues to do the same. Oppose this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I am glad to have the author of the bill on the floor, Mr. SCALISE.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my guardian angel.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, President Biden's threat to veto H.R. 1 tells everything we need to know about the bill. It will unleash American energy and bring down energy costs.

H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, is about increasing domestic production, permitting reform, streamlining energy exports, and reversing President Biden's anti-energy agenda.

In the first week of Joe Biden's Presidency, he stopped American energy production by halting needed permits

for energy production and shutting down the Keystone pipeline, also sending home 300 West Virginians who were out there working. He drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserves while failing to fix the problems that he had created.

Americans are sick of these policies, which is why they elected a Republican majority to be a needed check on the Biden administration's war on American energy.

H.R. 1 is necessary to jump-start American energy production, and is one of many crucial energy policies that I am looking forward to supporting.

Mr. Chair, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), my good friend, the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I thank my dear friend from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for her leadership and for yielding. I truly appreciate her leadership on energy policy, as we are seeing here today, and also for her working with us on getting this Lower Energy Costs Act to the floor, and, hopefully, passed over to the Senate shortly. She has been a champion on energy issues of all kinds, but especially on the pipeline issue specific to West Virginia.

Pipelines are so critical to America's energy independence. In fact, we deal with making it easier to move pipelines and build pipelines in America. A lot of the infrastructure that we need to make this country grow is being held up right now from a lot of radical regulations on the left and outside groups that don't want American energy. They are fine with getting dirty energy from foreign countries, but they want to make it harder to get American energy. Pipelines are part of that ability for us to bring back energy production to America and provide for our own energy needs and not be dependent on other countries.

Although construction on the Mountain Valley pipeline is essentially complete, it continues to be tied up in the courts. I understand the frustration that proponents of the pipeline are experiencing. I especially want to thank Congresswoman MILLER for her leadership because she has truly been fighting to get this project done.

At the end of the day, until this project is done, it is not only going to be helping the people of West Virginia, but so many other people. I look forward to continuing to work through this issue with my friend from West Virginia and others in our Conference as we continue to push for more American energy production that will lower costs for families, not just in my home State of Louisiana or my friend from West Virginia's home State, but also for people all across America.

Bad energy policy hurts families everywhere, especially low-income families. It is time we get this policy right. I thank my friend from West Virginia for her leadership.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank Leader SCALISE for taking the time to highlight such an important project. He has been a champion of American energy and the Mountain Valley pipeline is a great example of domestic energy production.

I am from an energy-producing State and I have seen and lived the effects of bad energy policy coming out of Washington, which is exactly why I came to Congress to fight for West Virginians and my like-minded fellow Americans.

Today, I am introducing the complete American pipelines act, a bill to complete the Mountain Valley pipeline and other America-first projects that have been needlessly held up by left-wing radical courts.

All gas from the Mountain Valley pipeline will supply domestic energy markets.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, this means lower energy prices across the country as supply will dramatically increase. The Mountain Valley pipeline is crucial to American energy. Remember that Americans' energy security is our American security.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), a member of our committee.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, Republicans' polluters over people act is a disaster of a bill. Not only does this legislation prioritize massive giveaways to Big Oil, gas corporations, and mining companies, but it sells out hardworking families who want nothing more than to breathe clean air and drink clean water.

If Republicans are successful in making this legislation law, those corporate polluters will deplete our natural resources and destroy millions of acres of wildlife, and they will do it for pennies on the dollar. New pipelines will be constructed without the input of critical Federal agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency.

These massive corporations could be exempt from lawsuits when they spill toxic chemicals or contaminate our drinking water supplies.

This bill has the fingerprints of Big Oil lobbyists all over it.

Perhaps the most embarrassing part of this bill is how good of a return on investment it is for fossil fuel companies.

Last year, a Big Oil CEO admitted during an Energy and Commerce hear-

ing to cashing in on stock he owned in his own company at a time when people were feeling maximum pain at the pump. He told me he did it at a 9 percent markup. That predatory behavior clearly hasn't swayed the authors of H.R. 1.

I would imagine that is because the same Big Oil corporations that stand to benefit most from this bill have donated millions to Republican politicians over the years. They will make that money back in a matter of minutes if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Chair, Congress' job is to serve the hardworking folks that we represent, not pad the profits of oil barons who run ExxonMobil or Shell.

Mr. Chair, our constituents deserve better, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 36¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 36½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the vice chairman of the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1.

I stand before you like everybody in this Chamber who is a father and a grandfather, somebody who wants to leave this Earth better than we found it.

□ 1430

Some in the past have argued that we must sacrifice affordable energy and reliable energy so that we can be clean. We have seen Europe go down this path. They pushed back on fracking, and they pushed back on nuclear power. Today, they buy fracked fuel from an enemy.

We have been told that we must give up affordability and reliability so that we can be clean. This is a false choice, and H.R. 1 is a path to affordable, reliable, and clean energy.

Let's be honest. The U.S. energy sector is not the enemy. They are the answer to our energy future.

I ask my colleagues, why do you hate fossil fuels?

Let's hate emissions. Let's hate the emissions and not the source.

This is why H.R. 1 is so important. It is an opportunity to accomplish all three of these goals.

At its core, H.R. 1 is about responsibly building America's energy infrastructure.

The rest of the world is dying for American energy. We can replace dirty Russian, Venezuelan, and Iranian petroleum products. We can reduce more emissions than any proposal on the left simply by using U.S. energy products.

H.R. 1 pushes back on the narrative that has been spun about Republicans not caring about the Earth. More importantly, without the permitting reforms in H.R. 1, none of us can accomplish our climate or energy goals.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the majority's polluters over people act, a massive handout to some of the world's most profitable and most powerful corporations.

It is a Big Oil giveaway that would hike the deficit instead of helping families, instead of protecting our planet, and instead of lowering costs for consumers and slashing energy bills.

Republicans seem to have just one priority, and that is helping the rich get richer. Through price gouging and war profiteering, Big Oil has doubled their profits to record levels. They are hoarding millions of acres of our public land, and they are using these unprecedented resources to line their pockets.

Exxon just announced \$35 billion in stock buybacks, and Chevron shareholders are pocketing \$75 billion.

Yet, what is the Republican plan? It is to triple down on allegiance to Big Oil, give away more Federal land, invite more offshore drilling, unleash more pollution into our water and our air and our land, and leave the taxpayers footing the bill.

Climate change is here. We don't have time to wait. Americans know that securing our future means investing in clean energy.

Families know their health depends on it; economists know our prosperity depends on it; and the Pentagon knows our national security depends on it. It is only MAGA Republicans who don't understand our future depends on a thriving clean energy economy.

Last year, we proudly enacted the largest climate investment in history, and now we are proudly voting "no" on the polluters over people act.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who is a Florida Gator.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from South Carolina for yielding. Go Gators.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, which would unleash American energy, lower energy prices, and restore the United States as energy independent and as an energy leader in the world.

I thank my good friends, Leader SCALISE and Chair RODGERS, and my good friend here from South Carolina—he is a good man even though he roots for the wrong team—for being such strong leaders on the issue and bringing this legislation to the floor.

Since the Biden administration came into office, Americans have been faced with a persisting energy crisis. We are in the midst of unprecedented increases in the costs of living, and I continue to hear from my constituents regarding how difficult it is to make ends meet.

I have heard from numerous constituents who are facing the prospect

of losing their livelihood due to increased energy costs driving up their business' operational costs.

Tragically, other constituents are now facing severe financial hardship and facing increased energy costs while on fixed incomes. Our seniors are having a very hard time, Mr. Chairman.

My constituents deserve energy policies that make energy more affordable for Americans, not more expensive.

Not only will H.R. 1 unleash American energy to decrease costs, but it will also spur the mining and processing of critical minerals domestically. It is essential that we do this. We are too dependent on our adversaries, particularly China, for these minerals that we use in nearly every aspect of our economy. H.R. 1 will allow us to produce innovative technologies and critical resources here at home and not in China.

This bill will return the United States as a global energy leader and secure America's future from dependencies on our adversaries.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for yielding. He is a great man, and he is a leader on these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), who is a member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to call attention to how Republicans' polluters energy package will do little of nothing to finally—and I have to censor my poster here, Mr. Chairman—fix the grid once and for all.

In February 2021, my own State of Texas had a catastrophic grid failure during a deadly winter storm that caused 246 deaths and left 5 million people in record cold temperatures without heat and businesses without power. Last summer, Texans again had to deal with the dangerous and unexpected generation failures that put further strain on our State's electric grid. These extreme weather events are not unique to Texas.

Despite these continued problems of grid resiliency, the Republican-led package we are voting on will do little of nothing to actually fix the grid.

It is, in fact, harmful. It is hyperpartisan. This package will make the grid less stable. We need to make investments in electric transmissions to meet our energy needs, create good-paying jobs, and have cleaner air to breathe.

This package will do little to address the lower energy costs for people across north Texas. Not only will it not help constituents pay their energy bills, but CBO estimates that this bill will actually increase the deficit over the 2023–2033 period by roughly \$2.4 billion.

That is why I urge my Republican colleagues to stop putting polluters over people and meet us in the middle to pass a bipartisan, comprehensive solution that bolsters our Nation's energy independence, helps the middle class, and finally fixes the grid.

Fix the grid, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, we should fix the grid and harden it from the EMP threats and other things, but while we are doing that, we need the pipeline infrastructure to get the resources to where they need to go, and that is in our communities so that baseload generation can happen.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gentleman from Ohio who understands energy. He is the chairman of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

With H.R. 1, we are working to lower energy costs for consumers across America by unleashing American energy and strengthening American supply chains.

H.R. 1 addresses regulatory red tape and permitting barriers to the domestic development of energy without compromising environmental protections.

The Lower Energy Costs Act also encourages domestic processing and refining of critical energy resources to ensure that components for all energy sources can be made right here in America.

As chair of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials, I am proud that H.R. 1 includes seven bills that passed through our subcommittee and full committee through regular order.

The bills encourage the domestic refining of critical energy resources, allow for flexible approaches to permitting, support national security, promote innovation that is currently stalled in EPA red tape, repealed two sections of the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act, and protect American refining capacity from agency overreach.

I thank Representatives CARTER of Georgia, JOYCE of Pennsylvania, PENCE, CURTIS, PFLUGER, PALMER, and CRENSHAW for their work on this important legislation.

In addition, H.R. 1 includes my bill, the Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Energy Potential Act, under section 10007. The section would amend the Natural Gas Act to repeal all restrictions on the import and export of natural gas. Removing such restrictions would help facilitate timely exports of LNG and help our allies. A stronger LNG export industry also means increased domestic production of natural gas and lower domestic prices.

I have heard my Democratic colleagues across the aisle criticize H.R. 1 because they say it does nothing for clean energy. This could not be further from the truth. H.R. 1 includes several

provisions that incorporate focused flexibilities into certain environmental statutes in order to create an improved regulatory landscape for refining and processing critical minerals.

Mr. Chairman, what are the industries that need critical minerals the most? Those are the wind, solar, and battery technology industries—all clean energy technologies.

We do almost no critical mineral refining and processing in the United States. That must change, or we risk becoming dangerously dependent on China for our energy and transportation systems.

The International Energy Agency estimates that the demand for critical minerals will double by 2040. We want to meet that demand with American resources and reduce reliance on China.

I will close by thanking Chair RODGERS for her leadership on the Lower Energy Costs Act. Energy security is national security, and through H.R. 1, we can unleash American energy dominance and lower energy costs for American families, thereby lowering inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. SCHRIER). The doctor is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, just last year, we made the largest investment in clean energy technology and climate science ever. The intention is to spur research and innovation in cutting-edge technologies and then accelerate development and construction of a modernized electric grid, solar and wind farms, modular nuclear reactors, and improved hydropower. However, none of that funding will actually affect climate change if we can't streamline the permitting process.

Frankly, it is pretty exciting to me to think about permitting reform as an area where Democrats and Republicans can work together, but let's be clear that speeding up the permitting process does not mean throwing all environmental protections out the window. That is essentially what today's bill, H.R. 1, their top priority, does today.

It doesn't streamline permitting. It undermines environmental protections and is a huge handout to fossil fuel companies, in some cases allowing them to avoid environmental regulations altogether. It pushes our energy system in the wrong direction.

There is urgency to shift to energy sources that don't emit greenhouse gases. Some of the glaciers on Mount Rainier in my district have already disappeared. That is why we do need to improve the permitting process.

However, the bill we are addressing today decimates that process, putting natural resources at risk and fast-tracking more drilling for oil and gas and mining for minerals on our public lands.

By the way, there are already 9,000 permits out there for oil and gas extraction that aren't even being used, and oil and gas companies are making record-shattering profits right now, quarter over quarter. They don't need another gift from Congress.

It is time to prioritize clean energy projects, and it is those permits that require the most expediency.

This bill isn't permitting reform, and it won't cut costs for American families. When they are ready, I look forward to working with my colleagues on real, serious, pragmatic permitting reform that will allow for the quickest possible transition to cleaner sources. We owe it to generations we will never know.

□ 1445

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chair, Ohio families are paying too much for gasoline. They are paying too much for heat. They are paying too much at the grocery store, partly due to rising production costs on farms.

A recent survey by ABC and The Washington Post found that roughly 40 percent of Americans are financially worse off today than they were just 2 years ago. They are begging for relief from soaring prices, and Republicans are answering their calls for help.

That is why I am proud to support H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. No more relying on dictators for oil. We are going to solve this problem the American way, with American workers, American ingenuity, and American energy.

H.R. 1 does this by fixing the broken permit process so that energy producers can do their jobs faster and cheaper. We are going to unleash American energy, which will lower costs and get our economy moving in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to think of the millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet. Show them you care and vote for H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. THANEDAR).

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is not an all-of-the-above energy bill that will help lower costs for Americans.

I rise today in opposition to this bill because it would worsen the destructive effects of climate change and line the pockets of the wealthy at the expense of the most vulnerable constituents in my district.

Mr. Chair, my constituents are sick and tired of politicians in this town using their positions of power to help corporations at the expense of people.

Fossil fuel companies and the lobbyists want to lessen environmental regulations so that they can pump massive amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and cash in, all at the expense of the people.

In southwest Detroit, corporations continue to emit harmful and unpleasant fumes around the low-income neighborhoods in the area. This bill will help them continue to pollute and worsen environmental injustice.

In my district, climate change has increased the rate and severity of flooding. My constituents must endure property damage, water contamination, and in some cases the loss of loved ones.

Last Congress, this body made historic changes by passing the Inflation Reduction Act, reducing the pollution in our communities that is disproportionately felt by low-income and disadvantaged communities. We must not turn back.

I came to Congress to fight against bills like H.R. 1 because they put my constituents directly at risk. It is absurd to lessen environmental regulations at a time when corporations choose pollution and profits over people. Please don't pass this disastrous bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in full, unambiguous support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The Energy and Commerce Committee recently heard from David Hickman, a farmer, who described our current economy as the most perilous time for American agriculture. He is right, and he is not alone.

Every day that I am in Georgia's First Congressional District, whether I am talking to a parent, a farmer, a teacher, a trucker, or a small business owner, I hear the same concern: Inflation is too high. Everything, from diesel to food, is more expensive under this President, who cannot stop himself from spending your money, stealing your retirement funds, and stomping on your small business.

The average household is paying \$10,000 more per year as a result of Biden's policies. What is worse is that pain is the point.

On day one of his Presidency, President Biden declared war on American energy, and at breakneck speed ended American energy independence and killed thousands of jobs.

What came next? Inflation, high interest rates, small businesses closing their doors, and even more inflation.

When you plunge a knife into the heart of our economy, you can't be surprised when it begins bleeding out.

Fortunately, House Republicans are stepping up and delivering solutions for the American people. H.R. 1 will increase American energy production, reform the permitting process for all industries, reverse this administration's anti-energy policies, streamline energy infrastructure, and boost the production and processing of critical minerals. That is a long-winded way of saying that this bill will make our energy sector more affordable, more efficient, and will create more jobs.

The American people told us that inflation and high energy prices were their number one concern, and we are listening by making it the House's number one priority. It doesn't even matter if you think we should "drill, baby, drill" or never use fossil fuels again, we need to be able to build in America again.

That is why I am particularly glad that my bill, H.R. 1070, was included in this legislation. It will help bring necessary permitting reform and investment in America's critical mineral mining and processing. Right now we rely almost entirely on China for critical minerals needed for batteries, smartphones, military technologies, and more.

Simply put, this is not energy independence. We depend more on China than we have ever relied on OPEC or any other countries for oil. It is a national security concern to depend on any one country that much for such an essential material.

My district is one of the few places in America that mines critical minerals, and we are eager to bring more of this essential and valuable supply chain home.

H.R. 1 is an important step, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ).

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear. I support our energy economy. I stand by New Mexico's energy workers, who help fuel our economy. New Mexico's Second Congressional District is one of the top energy producing areas in the entire world. In fact, Lea County, in my district, produces more oil than any other county in the United States.

About half of New Mexico's fossil fuel operations are on public lands, and royalties from the industry make up about a third of our State's annual budget. With an industry so large, there are a lot of good-paying jobs for rural New Mexicans.

Congress is not debating a bill to support energy workers that are essential to my district. We aren't even debating ways to lower energy costs for Americans, no matter what name Republicans give this bill. This bill is about the same old thing, padding the pockets of executives at the cost of energy workers.

Just last year, as you can see, when Americans saw gas prices as high as \$5 per gallon at the pump, oil and gas companies made not millions, not billions, but trillions of dollars in profit. While my constituents were paying \$100 to fill up their pickup truck, Exxon chiefs were making \$55 billion in profits. My colleagues across the aisle want to make them even richer at our expense.

In the Permian Basin, oil and gas production has increased nearly every year since 2013, and it is on track to reach new, even higher production

records this year. We are already unleashing American energy, but these profits aren't going to the workers in my district. They are going to the wealthy CEOs with collections of massive mansions and cars. While the energy workers in my district are living right here, in tents and temporary trailer homes, the CEOs are living right up here in Hawaii and mansions all across the world.

While our folks risk their health and safety to make these profits, we need to make sure that our priorities are in the right place. This bill is toxic, literally. It would increase pollution by removing the methane emission regulations and gutting the Clean Air Act.

Asthma rates in southeast New Mexico are the highest in the region, largely connected to methane and other emissions. Republicans want to make this air dirtier, sending more kids to the hospital.

According to Somos Un Pueblo Unido, nearly one in two energy workers has reported an injury on the job, and most of those injuries are permanent. If this bill really cared about the energy industry, it would start by prioritizing the people who work in it.

As the Representative for New Mexico's Second Congressional District, I will always prioritize my constituents, the hardworking energy workers, over the Big Oil CEOs from outside of my district.

That is why I am working on bipartisan legislation to ensure that our energy workers aren't being forgotten. Instead of focusing on growing the record profits for executives and CEOs, my bill would focus on protecting the backbone of our energy economy, our energy workers. I am focused on investing in the workers who have generated hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue to our State.

When I got to Congress, many people told me to be cautious. They said be careful, be scared of the Big Oil barons. I was told that they are powerful and that if I don't agree with them and pad their pockets, I am going to be their number one target.

Guess what? I am not scared, and we won't be silenced. To the CEOs watching this from their glamorous mansions, just know I will fight to ensure New Mexico's workers are a priority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration data, the average price for gasoline in 2022 was \$1.80 per gallon more than when President Biden assumed office.

H.R. 1 is not just about energy independence. That is the underlying foundation, but what it is really about is the quality of life for the American people here at home and the cost of energy that is feeding the skyrocketing inflation.

The average price of gas in 2020 was \$2.26 per gallon. The average price of gas in 2022 was \$4.06 per gallon, reach-

ing a peak of over \$5 per gallon in June of 2022.

According to the Department of Energy's Low-Income Energy Affordability Data, the LEAD Tool, low-income households spend 8.6 percent of their income on energy expenses. Depending on location and income, certain households spend as much as 30 percent of their income on energy expenses. The energy burden for low-income households is three times higher than non-low-income households.

In rural parts of the country, like where I represent in Appalachia, you are very familiar with that area, it is a real problem when families have to choose between putting gas in their car or groceries on the table. It is a real challenge when they have to choose between paying their heating bill or buying clothes for their kids to go to school. This is what H.R. 1 begins to address for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

From the minute that President Biden took office, he waged war against American energy production and the independence that we previously held.

The Biden administration canceled the Keystone XL pipeline on day one, imposed a \$6 billion tax on natural gas, and promised \$27 billion to special interest climate groups, and severely limited our fracking capabilities. These are just a few of the examples of why our energy prices are up 40 percent since the President took office.

In my mind, everything that can be made in America should be, including energy. American-made energy provides jobs, creates economic growth, lowers prices, and is an important part of our national security.

The United States must become energy independent once again, and regulatory hurdles for energy production here at home must be rolled back. This begins with permitting reform and cutting the burdensome red tape that suppresses innovation and development.

I was proud to work on commonsense reforms in the South Carolina General Assembly, and I am excited to see this being done at the Federal level. H.R. 1 is a top priority for House Republicans. We want to work for the people, not against them.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, this legislation will enhance our Nation's domestic energy production while lowering energy costs for Americans across our great country. I urge everybody to support H.R. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 21¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 25½ minutes remaining.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, our friends across the aisle ran for office in 2022 and took the majority narrowly—by five seats.

It was a hard-fought battle, and many promised to reduce the deficit. Here we are today debating H.R. 1, their first major bill, literally number one, and what have they chosen as their top issue in this Congress?

A \$117 billion deficit-busting taxpayer giveaway to polluters; as if oil companies who posted record profits in the billions need more help.

First of all, if we are keeping score here, add up this Big Oil giveaway with the rich tax cheat protection act that passed, and that is a whopping \$231 billion that would be added to the deficit by legislation that passed this House already.

I thought the Republican majority was running to reduce the deficit. It looks like the exact opposite is happening.

Also, where is the budget?

President Biden presented his. We still see no budget from the House majority.

Second, to call this bill a little out of step would be an understatement. As a result of climate change, we see in Florida extreme hurricanes, rising seas, and extreme heat.

We have public health issues there: asthma, cancer, and other issues.

We see society moving forward. Major auto manufacturers are going all in on electric vehicles. Utilities are moving away from fossil fuels toward wind, solar, nuclear, green hydrogen, and others. Gas in central Florida is between \$3 to \$3.25. Inflation has dropped 7 months in a row.

This bill looks like it missed the moment, and now it is just a windfall for Big Oil. When gas was sky-high, Mr. Chair, many colleagues across the aisle criticized Biden for using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve during this disruption to lower gas prices.

This bill wouldn't guarantee lower gas prices; not now, not in the future. It would guarantee more pollution, more sickness, and a step backward.

Third, we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, a very popular law that is transforming us to a clean energy economy before our very eyes.

America is moving forward. Apparently, our colleagues across the aisle are the last to know. They want to repeal the Inflation Reduction Act, including popular provisions. That didn't work well under ObamaCare, and I don't think it is going to work out now.

Lastly, it mandates drilling off of Florida shores. Our top industry is tourism. We need to protect our shores.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise today to lend my voice in support of H.R. 1.

President Biden declared war on American energy the day he took office. In fact, he blocked the Keystone XL pipeline that would have yielded 800,000 barrels of oil per day and created 33,000 American jobs.

In an ominous sign of his policies to come, he put America last and approved the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to benefit Russia.

The Biden administration also illegally halted all onshore oil and gas lease sales, crushing the energy market and driving up costs.

American families didn't sign up for or vote for higher energy costs, but that is exactly what the Biden administration has delivered.

In fact, the price of gas reached \$5 a gallon just last summer, for the first time in U.S. history. This Lower Energy Costs Act will help restore American energy independence and decrease Biden's harmful regulatory burdens.

In fact, this bill repeals the natural gas tax imposed by the inflation increase act. It stops President Biden from imposing a ban on fracking. It streamlines the Federal permitting process and allows drilling on Federal lands.

It rolls back a \$27 billion green slush fund. It gets rid of many other green fees imposed by the inflation increase act.

It ends the moratorium on new coal leasing and helps end dependence on foreign countries for vital energy.

We don't need to go to China or Saudi Arabia for our energy needs. Our country has all that we need right here, put in the ground for us by the Lord above.

H.R. 1 will finally allow energy producers to realize their full potential by ridding them of unnecessary and onerous permitting processes that take years to navigate.

This bill is a step in the right direction to reduce the regulatory burden and reignite American energy independence, which is so vital for our economy.

I thank my Republican friends for prioritizing this important issue in this new Congress, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Chair, permitting reform, we all want it. There is a simple solution. Separate the question. But why not? We need to ask why not.

Because this bill includes massive handouts to big corporations and incentivizes them to leak methane into the atmosphere.

Let's just look at the bill's name: LECA. They are telling it like it is, folks, and we should be listening.

There is a choice being made here by House Republicans, Mr. Chair. They are not doing this to make our system more efficient or to lower costs for the American people, quite the opposite.

This bill repeals \$4.5 billion in home electrification, a program that the Department of Energy estimates could save Americans thousands of dollars annually.

If we were focused on lowering costs for American families, this is what we would be focused on.

I talk to west Michiganders every single day about what they want and what they need.

We want to protect the Great Lakes. We want to lower our energy costs, and that means investing in conservation efforts and putting smart regulations in place that support the longevity of the Great Lakes economy. That means ensuring a future for the next generation of west Michiganders.

The Big Oil giveaway act does none of that. It greatly expands companies' ability to exploit public land.

Michigan-3 is home to a large portion of the Grand River watershed and miles of beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline. I support protecting our most beautiful protected areas, not stripping them for parts.

What House Republicans are doing is this: Holding an antiquated permitting system hostage to extract benefits for Big Oil corporations.

If they want to come to the table in good faith on serious bipartisan efforts to streamline the permitting process and lower energy costs for American families, I will be the first in line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. This is about clean, reliable, and affordable energy.

My constituents in the 17th Congressional District are feeling the pain at the pump, on their electric bills and their home heating costs, and in almost every single one of their purchases due to the increase in energy costs under the Biden administration.

Gas prices have risen over 51 percent since President Biden took office. Residential electrical costs in New York State have risen over 26 percent since President Biden took office, 24 percent nationwide. Utility gas is up 44 percent.

In just the last year, energy costs in the New York metropolitan region are up almost 10 percent. Not only does the cost of energy take a toll on families across America, but it has a compounding effect throughout the supply chain, driving prices of groceries and food ever higher.

This out-of-control inflation has created a massive crunch on the budgets of middle-class families across New York State, but perhaps no more so than right in the Hudson Valley where folks are facing energy bills in the thousands of dollars every month just to heat and power their homes.

It is fueling the affordability crisis in New York State, and it is exactly why I am proud to support H.R. 1, which will restore our Nation's energy independence by increasing the production and export of domestic energy while reducing the regulatory burdens that stifle American energy.

We need an all-of-the-above approach that includes gas, nuclear, and renewables. That has been emphatically clear for years.

Making America more dependent on foreign energy adds more pollution, not less, to our climate. H.R. 1 unleashes American energy and will drive down inflation, providing Hudson Valley families with the real relief they so desperately need.

Just some facts: 60 percent of New Yorkers rely on natural gas, and 70 percent of our electricity is generated by natural gas.

We have had a 60 percent reduction in greenhouse gases because of natural gas, greater than renewables. Those are the facts, and that is why we need to pass H.R. 1.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our country needs energy to flourish. Democrats know that means authorizing energy projects.

The law requires corporations to engage with communities, follow our bedrock environmental principles, and ultimately advance projects that offer greater benefits than costs.

Whether it is oil, natural gas, solar, or wind, the standard is the same. We shouldn't move forward until we know that the project delivers for consumers, taxpayers, and communities.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1 would eliminate that determination and instead put corporate interests like Big Oil in charge of what energy projects get authorized.

H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, gives billions of dollars in taxpayer-funded subsidies to big oil and gas.

It would let fossil fuel companies hoard thousands of unused leases, require the authorization of drilling on federally protected lands, give unilateral authority to corporations to create their own environmental impact statements, and force taxpayers to pay to clean up hazardous mining waste.

Congress should be doing the right thing by looking at reforms that protect taxpayers when approving energy projects.

That is why I offered an amendment that would require oil, gas, and coal companies to put up a bond that actually covers the cost of cleaning up their messes from drilling and mining.

That way, American taxpayers aren't on the hook to foot the billions of dollars needed to find and plug abandoned wells.

Unfortunately, protecting the taxpayer from cleaning up big energy's messes from drilling and mining is too controversial for my colleagues across

the aisle, and my amendment was not put on the floor for a vote.

We can still come together in a bipartisan manner. We can and should enact permitting reform that protects American taxpayers.

That is why I am submitting an amendment for the RECORD that requires the Secretaries of Energy and the Interior to certify that this bill would lower costs for American consumers and ban oil and gas exploration on protected public lands.

These changes protect us all from footing the cost of big energy's record-high profits.

To my colleagues across the aisle: You have an opportunity to prove to your constituents back home that you are putting them over polluters.

Will you stand up for consumers and taxpayers to lower costs, or will you do the bidding of big energy?

This amendment puts that question to each of us.

Are we for the people or for polluters?

With this vote, you will show your allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of this amendment.

Ms. Porter of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION D—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 40001. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior jointly submit to Congress a certification that the implementation of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, would lower costs for American consumers and taxpayers.

SEC. 40002. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not authorize any oil and gas exploration activities or conduct an oil and gas lease sale on any unit of the National Park System, national wildlife refuge, national trail, national conservation area, national monument, or national recreation area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

Under the Biden administration, American families are facing skyrocketing bills and rising costs of everyday goods.

I see this and experience this every day as I talk to the constituents of Florida's Seventh District. By no fault of their own, they are struggling to put food on the table, gas in their cars, and to pay their bills.

I thank our leadership and I thank Speaker MCCARTHY for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor to help ease the burden many Americans feel by lowering costs.

Not only will H.R. 1 lower energy costs, but it will also streamline our energy infrastructure and make us

more competitive on the global stage as we are losing and being outpaced by adversarial nations, such as China and Russia.

President Biden has waged a war, but not on our adversaries, on American energy, and he has made us more reliant on the adversarial nations I mentioned before, Russia and China.

This administration has made us dependent upon our aggressors and weaker than ever, but no more. This legislation will get us one step closer to becoming energy independent and then dominant by increasing exports of American energy. It is time to restore our position on the world stage and ease the burden on every American family.

I thank you so much for this opportunity. I am in strong, strong support of this.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act.

As a doctor, I am all too familiar with the harmful consequences of pollution and other environmental dangers on people's health.

Frontline communities near high-polluting corporations already bear too much of the burden of environmental injustice.

For example, people living near fossil fuel drilling sites are at greater risk for pre-term birth, cancer, asthma, and other respiratory diseases.

□ 1515

We must do more to protect people's health, not silence the voices of these vulnerable communities like this bill aims to do, not speeding up permit approvals without local families' input on projects that will go in their backyards like this bill aims to do.

This bill will also make the air we breathe dirtier and the people sicker by sacrificing key environmental protections under the Clean Air Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, and other laws, all to increase fossil fuel energy production in a reckless and irresponsible way.

This is the wrong approach. Instead, we should secure America's energy independence with clean, reliable energy that will lower costs for families and protect people's health.

This includes building out our domestic supply chain for critical minerals like lithium while producing renewable energy.

We can do this through projects like geothermal energy production and lithium recovery at the Salton Sea in Imperial County, California, in my district.

The innovative approach we are taking there is responsible energy production with a closed-loop clean system that also creates lithium extraction with geothermal energy.

This is better for the environment, better for our communities, and better

for the economy. This shows that we do not have to sacrifice health and the environment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1 and instead work toward solutions that bring everyone together to move our country forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend and colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend from Ohio for yielding. I rise in strong support for this legislative commitment that House Republicans have initiated, H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act. I thank my friend from Ohio for his leadership. I thank my good friend from Arkansas, Chairman BRUCE WESTERMAN of the Natural Resources Committee for his fine work on this important bill.

Under this administration's green energy only push, we are driving up costs for central Arkansas families, hurting our economy, and our national security.

We need in this Nation an all-of-the-above energy approach for the U.S. and for the globe.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration's most recent outlook, by 2050, global energy use will increase nearly 50 percent compared to today. While the share of primary energy consumption from renewables is predicted to increase from 15 to 27 percent by 2050, Mr. Chair, 83 percent of energy consumption in that period will still need to come from coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear. H.R. 1 takes this key step in the right direction.

Instead, Biden officials are only focusing on intermittent energy sources like wind and solar, for which we do not possess large-scale storage or provide a reliable and consistent source of energy.

We need to be a leader in powering the world, and an all-of-the-above energy strategy will do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on climate and for the role he played last Congress in passing the most historic climate legislation in the history of this country. Finally, something inspired young people, not just around this country, but around the world.

Now, what does the other side want to do? They want to start to repeal it.

That legislation which put \$369 billion into climate only marked 0.1 percent over the next 10 years of what our economy is going to be, \$300 trillion. It was a 0.1 percent down payment, the largest in history; and what do they want to do? They want to take away the \$27 billion Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

Where does that money go? It goes to rural America. It goes to factory towns. It goes to communities of color,

who have faced too much pollution, who have too much cancer in their communities. They want to take that money away from rural America, from factory towns, and who do they want to give it to? They want to give it to the fossil fuel companies. The fossil fuel companies, that is really what this bill is about. It is decreasing the royalty rate that fossil fuel companies pay on taxpayer land. It is a handout, a subsidy, a further subsidy to Big Oil.

Now, the GAO has said that it will do nothing to increase oil or gas production, and we all know the facts that oil production and gas production under this President is up. Those are the facts, that it is up.

They don't care about the production. Don't let them confuse you. They want to give subsidies to Exxon, Chevron, and Big Oil that are making record profits off the war in Ukraine and fleecing the American people.

They want to take away money from rural communities, take away money from factory towns, take away money from Americans who are suffering and give fossil fuel subsidies. That is wrong, and I thank Mr. PALLONE for opposing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 1 and permitting reform under the National Environmental Protection Act, also known as NEPA.

Nebraska has been on the frontlines of NEPA's impacts over the course of a decades-long expressway program through my Congressional District. It has taken 10 more years than it should have.

Under the Obama administration, the length of time for NEPA reviews climbed from 3.4 years in 2010 to 5.2 years in 2016.

President Trump rolled back the red tape, but President Biden brought it all back and expanded the prior requirements.

H.R. 1 makes reasonable reforms to ensure that NEPA is applied expeditiously and without unnecessarily burdening States.

In Nebraska, and I suspect way too many other States, commonsense solutions and mitigation strategies to steward our natural resources need to be protected, but we need to do it under NEPA.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans keep talking about lowering energy costs, but let's be honest with the American people. Right now, the price of oil is \$50 per barrel less than its high last year. The price of a gallon of gasoline is \$1.57 less than its high last year. The price of natural gas is 78 percent lower than it was at its high last year.

Of course, we would all like even lower prices, but the bottom line is, this bill is misnamed. It will not lower energy prices. It would make natural

gas more expensive by making Americans compete with consumers across the globe. It would make our electricity dirtier and more expensive. It would enrich the oil and gas companies that price-gouged American consumers last year.

This bill is nothing but a handout to the fossil fuel industry that would drive prices higher for Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, saying that gasoline prices are down is a little bit like giving an arsonist a medal for putting out a fire that he helped start.

They are still 50 percent higher than when President Biden took office. That is not counting inputs for ag products like fertilizer, which the natural feed stock is natural gas, all of those different issues.

That is not really the point in all of this. Two things can be true at once: The world's going to need more oil and natural gas and drive more electric cars in the next decade, and this bill has a little bit of something for everyone.

The last time we brought a refinery online in the United States with any true downstream capacity was the year I was born, 1976—46 years ago.

If we want to continue to build more electrification, have more batteries for more American-made electric vehicles, well, we need the rare earths to do it. This bill does those things.

When you live in a small community like I do in the geographic center of North America, we have recognized, very clearly, how hard it is to get the products that North Dakota makes that the rest of the world needs to market. Doesn't matter if it is corn. Doesn't matter if it is fertilizer. Doesn't matter if it is oil. Doesn't matter if it is natural gas.

We used to be the shining example in the whole world on how to put infrastructure in the ground. That is no longer the case, and it is not because Americans don't know how to do it. It is not because North Dakotans don't know how to produce it. It is because alphabet soup agencies in Washington, D.C., make it harder and harder and harder.

When we can't get those projects in the ground, we starve off capital. We are the only country in the world that is both energy and food secure. That is an incredible strategic advantage on the world stage.

In any normal place, we would maximize that. We would do everything we could to increase that, but we don't live in a normal place, Mr. Chairman. We live in Washington, D.C.

This bill will help us get infrastructure in the ground, help us produce those things that the world is starved for, and allow us energy independence, energy dominance, and also help com-

munities in States like mine continue to thrive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 1, the polluters over people act. I will take my time to point out two glaring flaws with this bill: First, H.R. 1 will make energy more expensive for Granite Staters.

Right now, natural gas is the single largest source of electricity in New England. When natural gas prices go up, electricity prices in New Hampshire go up, yet H.R. 1 makes it easier for natural gas producers to export American fuel to foreign adversaries like China. Making it easier for natural gas companies to export fuel to China, where the prices are currently higher, will cause U.S. natural gas prices to rise.

As a result, electricity prices in New Hampshire will rise, too.

My amendment to H.R. 1, which the Rules Committee did not make in order, would have addressed this problem, but instead of putting American consumers first, the majority is focused on lining the pockets of Big Oil and Gas companies.

The solution to our Nation's energy problems is building new low-cost renewables so we aren't reliant on expensive carbon-polluting forms of energy.

Second, H.R. 1 is going to actually weaken control on PFAS chemicals. In New Hampshire, we know just how damaging PFAS can be to our water supply and the communities that rely upon them. Congress should be making it more difficult to bring new PFAS chemicals to the market, but H.R. 1 erodes the chemical review process under the Toxic Substances Control Act, allowing new PFAS chemicals to come on the market without any consideration for the danger that they may present to the public. It is the responsibility of Congress to prevent these dangerous chemicals from coming to the market.

Rather than wasting our time pursuing legislation that puts polluters over people, let's focus on coming together.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we have said it over and over and over again, and there is no denying it. Energy security is national security. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

Unleashing American energy, production, permitting, put American energy back into play to address the needs and concerns of the American people, to lower inflation, and to ensure America's national security on the international stage. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

I look forward to closing here in a few minutes with some striking comments about telling the truth. I heard the ranking member from our Energy and Commerce Committee a little bit ago say, tell the American people the truth, and I respect him greatly. I am going to tell the American people the truth in just a little bit.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I keep hearing that Republicans want to lower energy costs with this bill and how important it is to export natural gas overseas. I want to take a moment to examine some history here.

Back in 2015, with a Republican-controlled House and a Republican-controlled Senate, Congress passed a bill that repealed the crude export ban. Since then, crude oil and petroleum product exports to China have tripled, and the amount of refining capacity on the East Coast of the United States has decreased by 36 percent.

This is not a coincidence. Lifting the export ban meant that oil producers saw more profits in sending their oil overseas, including to China, and little in refining it here at home. That led to 10 refineries closing in the intervening 7 years, destroying jobs.

It tied the price of oil in the U.S. firmly to the price of oil on global markets, which has been responsible for the gas prices roller coaster we have seen for the past few years.

Now, what that bill did was enrich a very small number of people who export oil at the expense of every other American who now has to pay a little bit more for gasoline.

Republicans, with this bill, want to turn around and do this for the natural gas industry, too. This bill makes it far too easy to export LNG abroad—yes, including to China. This would mean the same process would repeat.

You would pay more for energy. American factories and industries would pay more for energy. A very small sliver of natural gas businesses would profit. It is prioritizing the enrichment of the few over the needs of many Americans.

The sheer gall of calling this the Lower Energy Costs Act, in my opinion, is insulting. It is insulting to refinery workers who lost their jobs. It is insulting to the frontline communities next to fossil fuel plants that suffer from dirtier air. It is insulting to the hundreds of millions of Americans who would have to pay more to keep their houses warm each winter.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Speaker Emeritus of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership in opposing this reckless legislation that is on the floor today.

I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his leadership, as well as our ranking member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. LARSEN, for their setting the record straight in the different categories of this legislation.

The gentleman from New Jersey just set the record straight again. I thank the gentleman so much for giving a history lesson to some in this room who may not remember the course of events that has taken us to this place.

Today, Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in sounding the alarm, a five-alarm climate emergency, which is the existential threat of our time.

Many of our colleagues, including our distinguished ranking members, have gone into detail about opposition to this bill. I want to focus on the climate aspect.

It was with pride during my term as Speaker that House Democrats made climate our flagship issue. When we enacted the Inflation Reduction Act, our Nation took a landmark step to rescue our planet. Yet, our progress stands in sharp contrast to the reckless Republican bill before us, which, on every score, puts polluters first.

We know that climate is a health issue. The gentleman referenced that in his comments. While Democrats are slashing pollution to preserve clean air and water, this bill guts bedrock health protections to fast-track polluter projects.

Climate is an economic issue. While Democrats are creating jobs and lowering energy costs, this bill gives \$2.4 billion in handouts to the biggest polluters.

Climate is a national security issue. While Democrats are declaring America's energy independence, this bill seeks to keep us at the mercy of oil-rich dictators.

Finally, climate is a moral issue. While Democrats are honoring our obligation to pass on a healthy planet to our children and grandchildren, this bill is nothing short of a dereliction of duty.

It is God's creation. We are religious people here in this body, right? It is God's creation. Don't we have a responsibility to be good stewards of God's creation?

The climate emergency is putting lives at risk right now, with extreme weather pillaging communities that you represent and hitting families at the kitchen table.

With this legislation, Republicans have chosen to ignore the needs of America's working families. Instead, Republicans are putting polluters over people.

For the planet, and for the children, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, as is often said in this Chamber, I didn't anticipate debating, but as I sit on the floor listening to some of the things coming from the Democrats about this bill, a lot of it is just simply not true.

The Democrats are accusing us of providing funds and slush funds to Big Oil, but in the very Inflation Reduction Act that they passed last Congress—on a partisan basis, mind you—there is \$20 billion in that bill that goes to the green energy—I don't know—environment slush fund. The EPA is already saying, Mr. Chair, that that \$20 billion is being basically earmarked for a handful of special interests that the American people have no idea about.

The Democrats want to lecture us about making sure that we stop the polluters, but their own energy plan actually empowers the biggest polluter on the planet, and that is China. It is China that mines all the minerals for electric batteries, and China does not care about emission standards.

The Democrats have no problem empowering China when it comes to mineral production. They have no problem empowering China when it comes to oil production. They just want to limit it here in the United States.

This is the same backward thinking that the Europeans have realized in the face of Putin's aggression in Ukraine. It was all good to let Russia drill as long as Europe didn't drill.

Mr. Chair, that does not work when it comes to energy production. H.R. 1 brings common sense back to America's energy matrix. It is an all-of-the-above strategy.

Listen, I am a Member who has some issues, but I am voting for the legislation because it is far more important to put America in first position when it comes to energy exploration on the globe, as opposed to funding these Green New Deal think tanks and these Green New Deal energy consortiums that haven't proven that they can deliver baseload power to address the needs of the American people.

We have an energy problem. That is true. Our energy problem starts first with having cheap and readily available energy for poor Americans, middle-income Americans, small business owners, medium-sized business owners, and, yes, even the people who are wealthy among us.

Our economy thrives with a robust energy matrix, not one divided up based upon special interests from the left. That does not work. What works is actually using tried and true energy production standards.

By the way, when we drill for natural gas and explore for natural gas and oil here in America, we do it cleaner than anywhere else on the globe. We do it better than anywhere else on the globe, so much so that people want to import it from us.

That sounds like a quality plan for America, not the dogma from the Democrats.

I have been hearing the talking points all week. Polluters over people? That is a joke. The only people who are putting interests over people are the Democrats with their faulty energy policy. It must stop.

We have to put Americans first. Support H.R. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today, Republicans have completed the process of trying to determine what exactly their energy policy will be. It is not about energy independence. It is not even about an all-of-the-above energy approach. Instead, it is a return to the glory days for them of oil and gas running the show.

Today's bill, however, does nothing to chart a course for American energy policy. Instead, it is a political messaging bill. Industry admits it.

There was a Politico piece last week detailing how Republican industry allies feel about the bill. Rapidan Energy Group, which is run by Bob McNally, who testified at the Committee on Energy and Commerce's first hearing this year, sent an analysis note to their clients saying that H.R. 1 is doomed in the Senate. Several anonymous Republican Members have said the very same things themselves in press interviews.

Let's be clear: Three months into their majority, instead of using their power to seriously tackle issues in a bipartisan manner—and many of my colleagues on the Democratic side said today they wanted to work with Republicans on real energy policy—Republicans have chosen to put forward a messaging bill that I think is really an insult to every single American that is not an oil or gas executive.

It is a message bill, and the message is this: They want the energy your family uses to be dirtier and more expensive. It is a shame.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am calling this the polluters over people act because it eliminates the environmental protections that keep families and communities safe while doing nothing to lower energy costs. Everyday Americans need relief from high energy costs.

Big Oil is still making record profits, and instead of cracking down on price gouging, House Republicans are handing giveaways to big oil and gas company CEOs without delivering any help to working families.

The East Palestine train derailment and other recent catastrophes have shown just how dangerous putting profits before people can be.

As the climate crisis accelerates, we need real action to support clean, secure, and affordable American energy.

That is what House Democrats delivered last year with our historic investments that will help us lead the world in the transition to clean energy and will truly combat the worsening climate crisis. After all, extreme weather events are becoming more frequent and more extreme.

Just last week, it was the devastating and deadly tornado that ripped through Mississippi. These horrifying extreme weather events are costing families their loved ones, their homes, and their livelihoods.

House Republicans are attacking the very clean energy policies that hold polluters accountable, reduce costs for American families, and combat the worsening climate crisis.

House Republicans have the wrong priorities, and we should defeat the polluters over people act today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Throughout this debate, my Democratic colleagues have repeated misinformation and engaged in fearmongering as a tactic to convince American families to submit to their green agenda and just accept more expensive and less reliable energy as the new normal to undermine our economy, make the cost of living even higher, and, perhaps even more troubling, severely undermine our national security.

Apparently, my Democratic colleagues are okay with making China great again at the expense of the American people and the rest of the world.

I heard the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my colleague—again, who I have great respect for—say a few minutes ago: Tell the American people the truth.

Well, let's tell the American people some truth. According to a report by the LendingClub, at the end of 2022—that is 2 years into the Biden administration—9.3 million more United States consumers were living paycheck to paycheck compared to the prior year.

Of that group, 75 percent identified inflation as a reason for their financial situation to be worsening.

By the end of 2022, China's oil refining capacity exceeded the United States' oil refining capacity.

According to the International Energy Agency's oil market report, U.S. refining capacity is at 17.6 million barrels per day.

According to the China Petroleum and Chemical Industry Association, China's capacity is at 18.4 million barrels per day.

□ 1545

We are far more dependent on China today for the very rare earth minerals and critical minerals that are needed to pursue the renewable green energy plan that the Democrats are trying to

push. You can't get there in the timeframe that they are trying to get there, Mr. Chair, without becoming more dependent on China.

There are those who say that Republicans are climate deniers. That is simply not true. We simply believe that Republicans have better ideas to unleash America's energy and to restore America's energy independence. At the same time that those are good energy policies, they are also good climate policies.

Let me give you an example. Everybody says that the goal of addressing the climate problem is to reduce carbon emissions.

Mr. Chair, if that is truly the goal, why do we not want to export more American natural gas around the world?

According to the American Exploration and Production Council, if we would simply export four times the amount of natural gas that we are exporting today—which we could do easily because we have got a wealth of it—we could lower carbon emissions more than if we were to electrify every vehicle in America, put a solar panel and a battery backup on the home and the rooftop of every residential home in America, and build 57,000 industrial-strength windmills, all combined.

American natural gas is the cleanest form of natural gas on the planet. Our friends and allies in Europe sure wish they had some of that today because they have become dependent on Vladimir Putin for their sources of energy.

Look at the Germans, who decided to throttle their nuclear suite and become dependent on Russia for their energy.

What did they end up doing?

Forest clearing, burning wood to cook their food and heat their homes. We do not want to go the way of Europe. They have already tried all of this.

I implore my Democratic colleagues: We are not arguing about the goal. We agree with cleaner forms of energy.

What we are arguing about, it appears to me, is the timeframe in which to accomplish that and the amount of money and the change in the quality of life that it is going to require for the American people.

I am sure many of you went to college and you studied the business triangle: time, cost, and quality. You can't affect one of those without affecting the other two. With this rush to green, if we want to do this so fast before renewable forms of energy are mature enough technologically to be able to provide the baseload energy for our grid, to put fuel in our automobiles, if we want to do it that fast, it is going to cost a hell of a lot of money, and it is going to change for the worse the quality of life for the American people.

H.R. 1 is a commonsense energy package. If you lower energy costs, you are going to lower inflation. If you lower inflation, you are going to allow the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money. When American people keep their hard-earned

money, they come up with good ideas, and our economy begins to thrive.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1 is not about politics. It is about the American people. They are sick and tired of people inside the beltway taking and taking and taking while they are always having to do the giving.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 1. It is the right thing to do for the American people. Let's unleash American energy.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the Polluters Over People Act.

While it claims to lower American energy costs, it would directly result in policies that would cost taxpayers billions in environmental costs. Congress should not pass laws that benefit oil, gas, and mining companies at the expense of our public lands and public health.

I have worked diligently to conserve and protect our public resources, and ensure the federal government is a good steward of our public lands. This bill would severely cut the opportunity for communities to participate in the environmental review process of a project. It also fails to recognize tribal sovereignty; the U.S. federal government must honor its trust and treaty responsibilities to Tribal nations.

H.R. 1 ignores the fact that oil and gas companies have made billions in profits while Americans suffered under high prices at the pump during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. This bill would lower royalty rates and repeal interest fees to these companies, further lining their pockets while reducing the money the government receives for use of these lands.

Public lands are just that: they belong to the people—not to major corporations. Members of Congress have a responsibility to be good stewards of these resources.

Additionally, many mining companies are foreign-owned, like Antofagasta, the parent company of Twin Metals. That company's proposed sulfide-ore copper mine would put our public lands and waters at great risk of toxic mining pollution. After extraction, Antofagasta would ship our American minerals overseas to China for smelting and to be sold in the global market. How is it in our national interest to repurchase our own mined materials?

The rush to pass this legislation is a national security issue. Safeguards must be put into place when minerals are harvested from public lands—they should not be used to put the integrity of those lands or our national security at risk.

Our laws need to be updated, including meaningful permitting reform to facilitate the green energy transition. That is why Democrats included \$1 billion in the Inflation Reduction Act for federal agencies to more quickly and efficiently process permits. But H.R. 1 does not work with agencies to address permitting backlogs. Instead, it slashes environmental regulations and imposes arbitrary time limits on reviews. Permitting reform and updated regulations must be done responsibly, with good-faith participation from local communities, as well as a strong emphasis on equity, environment impacts, and public health. I am happy to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make this happen, but H.R. 1 is not the avenue to do so.

Mr. Chair, let me be clear: H.R. 1 is an attack on our public lands, which belong to Minnesotans and all Americans.

It should be rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 118-30 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Lower Energy Costs Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

DIVISION A—INCREASING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION, EXPORTS, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND CRITICAL MINERALS PROCESSING

Sec. 10001. Securing America's critical minerals supply.

Sec. 10002. Protecting American energy production.

Sec. 10003. Researching Efficient Federal Improvements for Necessary Energy Refining.

Sec. 10004. Promoting cross-border energy infrastructure.

Sec. 10005. Sense of Congress expressing disapproval of the revocation of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.

Sec. 10006. Sense of Congress opposing restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products.

Sec. 10007. Unlocking our domestic LNG potential.

Sec. 10008. Promoting interagency coordination for review of natural gas pipelines.

Sec. 10009. Interim hazardous waste permits for critical energy resource facilities.

Sec. 10010. Flexible air permits for critical energy resource facilities.

Sec. 10011. National security or energy security waivers to produce critical energy resources.

Sec. 10012. Ending future delays in chemical substance review for critical energy resources.

Sec. 10013. Natural gas tax repeal.

Sec. 10014. Repeal of greenhouse gas reduction fund.

Sec. 10015. Keeping America's refineries operating.

Sec. 10016. Homeowner energy freedom.

DIVISION B—TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, PERMITTING, AND PRODUCTION OF AMERICAN RESOURCES

Sec. 20001. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE LEASING AND OVERSIGHT

Sec. 20101. Onshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20102. Lease reinstatement.

Sec. 20103. Protested lease sales.

Sec. 20104. Suspension of operations.

Sec. 20105. Administrative protest process reform.

Sec. 20106. Leasing and permitting transparency.

Sec. 20107. Offshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20108. Five-year plan for offshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20109. Geothermal leasing.

Sec. 20110. Leasing for certain qualified coal applications.

Sec. 20111. Future coal leasing.

Sec. 20112. Staff planning report.

Sec. 20113. Prohibition on Chinese communist party ownership interest.

Sec. 20114. Effect on other law.

TITLE II—PERMITTING STREAMLINING

Sec. 20201. Definitions.

Sec. 20202. BUILDER Act.

Sec. 20203. Codification of National Environmental Policy Act regulations.

Sec. 20204. Non-major Federal actions.

Sec. 20205. No net loss determination for existing rights-of-way.

Sec. 20206. Determination of National Environmental Policy Act adequacy.

Sec. 20207. Determination regarding rights-of-way.

Sec. 20208. Terms of rights-of-way.

Sec. 20209. Funding to process permits and develop information technology.

Sec. 20210. Offshore geological and geophysical survey licensing.

Sec. 20211. Deferral of applications for permits to drill.

Sec. 20212. Processing and terms of applications for permits to drill.

Sec. 20213. Amendments to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Sec. 20214. Access to Federal energy resources from non-Federal surface estate.

Sec. 20215. Scope of environmental reviews for oil and gas leases.

Sec. 20216. Expediting approval of gathering lines.

Sec. 20217. Lease sale litigation.

Sec. 20218. Limitation on claims.

Sec. 20219. Government Accountability Office report on permits to drill.

Sec. 20220. E-NEPA.

TITLE III—PERMITTING FOR MINING NEEDS

Sec. 20301. Definitions.

Sec. 20302. Minerals supply chain and reliability.

Sec. 20303. Federal register process improvement.

Sec. 20304. Designation of mining as a covered sector for Federal permitting improvement purposes.

Sec. 20305. Treatment of actions under presidential determination 2022-11 for Federal permitting improvement purposes.

Sec. 20306. Notice for mineral exploration activities with limited surface disturbance.

Sec. 20307. Use of mining claims for ancillary activities.

Sec. 20308. Ensuring consideration of uranium as a critical mineral.

Sec. 20309. Barring foreign bad actors from operating on Federal lands.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING

Sec. 20401. Federal land use planning and withdrawals.

Sec. 20402. Prohibitions on delay of mineral development of certain Federal land.

Sec. 20403. Definitions.

TITLE V—ENSURING COMPETITIVENESS ON FEDERAL LANDS

Sec. 20501. Incentivizing domestic production.

TITLE VI—ENERGY REVENUE SHARING

Sec. 20601. Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf revenue.

Sec. 20602. Parity in offshore wind revenue sharing.

Sec. 20603. Elimination of administrative fee under the Mineral Leasing Act.
 Sec. 20604. Sunset.

DIVISION C—WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION AND ENERGY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 30001. Short title; table of contents.
 Sec. 30002. Certification.

DIVISION A—INCREASING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION, EXPORTS, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND CRITICAL MINERALS PROCESSING

Sec. 10001. Securing America's critical minerals supply.
 Sec. 10002. Protecting American energy production.
 Sec. 10003. Researching Efficient Federal Improvements for Necessary Energy Refining.
 Sec. 10004. Promoting cross-border energy infrastructure.
 Sec. 10005. Sense of Congress expressing disapproval of the revocation of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.
 Sec. 10006. Sense of Congress opposing restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products.
 Sec. 10007. Unlocking our domestic LNG potential.
 Sec. 10008. Promoting interagency coordination for review of natural gas pipelines.
 Sec. 10009. Interim hazardous waste permits for critical energy resource facilities.
 Sec. 10010. Flexible air permits for critical energy resource facilities.
 Sec. 10011. National security or energy security waivers to produce critical energy resources.
 Sec. 10012. Ending future delays in chemical substance review for critical energy resources.
 Sec. 10013. Natural gas tax repeal.
 Sec. 10014. Repeal of greenhouse gas reduction fund.
 Sec. 10015. Keeping America's refineries operating.
 Sec. 10016. Homeowner energy freedom.

SEC. 10001. SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS SUPPLY.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORGANIZATION ACT.—The Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2, by adding at the end the following:

“(d) As used in sections 102(20) and 203(a)(12), the term ‘critical energy resource’ means any energy resource—

“(1) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

“(2) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.”;

(2) in section 102, by adding at the end the following:

“(20) To ensure there is an adequate and reliable supply of critical energy resources that are essential to the energy security of the United States.”; and

(3) in section 203(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(12) Functions that relate to securing the supply of critical energy resources, including identifying and mitigating the effects of a disruption of such supply on—

“(A) the development and use of energy technologies; and

“(B) the operation of energy systems.”.

(b) SECURING CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE SUPPLY CHAINS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the requirements of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with

the appropriate Federal agencies, representatives of the energy sector, States, and other stakeholders, shall—

(A) conduct ongoing assessments of—

(i) energy resource criticality based on the importance of critical energy resources to the development of energy technologies and the supply of energy;

(ii) the critical energy resource supply chain of the United States;

(iii) the vulnerability of such supply chain; and

(iv) how the energy security of the United States is affected by the reliance of the United States on importation of critical energy resources;

(B) facilitate development of strategies to strengthen critical energy resource supply chains in the United States, including by—

(i) diversifying the sources of the supply of critical energy resources; and

(ii) increasing domestic production, separation, and processing of critical energy resources;

(C) develop substitutes and alternatives to critical energy resources; and

(D) improve technology that reuses and recycles critical energy resources.

(2) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “critical energy resource” has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101).

SEC. 10002. PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that States should maintain primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DECLARATION OF A MORATORIUM ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not declare a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing unless such moratorium is authorized by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 10003. RESEARCHING EFFICIENT FEDERAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR NECESSARY ENERGY REFINING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Energy shall direct the National Petroleum Council to—

(1) submit to the Secretary of Energy and Congress a report containing—

(A) an examination of the role of petrochemical refineries located in the United States and the contributions of such petrochemical refineries to the energy security of the United States, including the reliability of supply in the United States of liquid fuels and feedstocks, and the affordability of liquid fuels for consumers in the United States;

(B) analyses and projections with respect to—

(i) the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States;

(ii) opportunities for expanding such capacity; and

(iii) the risks to petrochemical refineries located in the United States;

(C) an assessment of any Federal or State executive actions, regulations, or policies that have caused or contributed to a decline in the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States; and

(D) any recommendations for Federal agencies and Congress to encourage an increase in the capacity of petrochemical refineries located in the United States; and

(2) make publicly available the report submitted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 10004. PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT AN INTER-

NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (d), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity, across an international border of the United States without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken, by the relevant official or agency identified under subparagraph (B), under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a border-crossing facility for which a person requests a certificate of crossing under this subsection, the relevant official or agency, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility unless the relevant official or agency finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the border-crossing facility is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL OR AGENCY.—The relevant official or agency referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil or natural gas pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), that the border-crossing facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the border-crossing facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity—

(A) if the border-crossing facility is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) if a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(C) if an application for a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which such application is denied; or

(ii) two years after the date of enactment of this Act, if such a permit has not been issued by such date of enactment.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

(B) **NATURAL GAS ACT.**—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(C) **OIL PIPELINES.**—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (d) shall affect the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to oil pipelines under section 60502 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) **TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.**—

(1) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.**—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **STATE REGULATIONS.**—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking “insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission’s powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)”.

(B) **SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.**—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking “the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”.

(c) **NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.**—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) shall be required pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof.

(d) **MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.**—No certificate of crossing under subsection (a), or Presidential permit (or similar permit), shall be required for a modification to—

(1) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility for which a Presidential permit (or similar permit) has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(3) a border-crossing facility for which a certificate of crossing has previously been issued under subsection (a).

(e) **PROHIBITION ON REVOCATION OF PRESIDENTIAL PERMITS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not revoke a Presidential permit (or similar permit) issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 12038 (43 Fed. Reg. 4957), Executive Order No. 10485 (18 Fed. Reg. 5397), or any other Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof, unless such revocation is authorized by an Act of Congress.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.**—

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsections (a) through (d), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **RULEMAKING DEADLINES.**—Each relevant official or agency described in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a).

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BORDER-CROSSING FACILITY.**—The term “border-crossing facility” means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at an international boundary of the United States.

(2) **MODIFICATION.**—The term “modification” includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, change in flow volume, addition or removal of an interconnection, or an adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations).

(3) **NATURAL GAS.**—The term “natural gas” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a).

(4) **OIL.**—The term “oil” means petroleum or a petroleum product.

(5) **ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION; REGIONAL ENTITY.**—The terms “Electric Reliability Organization” and “regional entity” have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o).

(6) **INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR; REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.**—The terms “Independent System Operator” and “Regional Transmission Organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

SEC. 10005. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE REVOCATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT FOR THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 29, 2019, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P., was granted a Presidential permit to construct, connect, operate, and maintain the Keystone XL pipeline.

(2) On January 20, 2021, President Biden issued Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037) that revoked the March 2019 Presidential permit for the Keystone XL.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the revocation by President Biden of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline.

SEC. 10006. SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING RESTRICTIONS ON THE EXPORT OF CRUDE OIL OR OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States has enjoyed a renaissance in energy production, with the expansion of domestic crude oil and other petroleum product production contributing to enhanced energy security and significant economic benefits to the national economy.

(2) In 2015, Congress recognized the need to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions and repealed all restrictions on the export of crude oil on a bipartisan basis.

(3) Section 101 of title I of division O of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (42 U.S.C. 6212a) established the national policy on oil export restriction, prohibiting any official of the Federal Government from imposing or enforcing any restrictions on the export of crude oil with limited exceptions, including a savings clause maintaining the authority to prohibit exports under any provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or re-

stricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a foreign government that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(4) Lifting the restrictions on crude oil exports encouraged additional domestic energy production, created American jobs and economic development, and allowed the United States to emerge as the leading oil producer in the world.

(5) In 2019, the United States became a net exporter of petroleum products for the first time since 1952, and the reliance of the United States on foreign imports of petroleum products has declined to historic lows.

(6) Free trade, open markets, and competition have contributed to the rise of the United States as a global energy superpower.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not impose—

(1) overly restrictive regulations on the exploration, production, or marketing of energy resources; or

(2) any restrictions on the export of crude oil or other petroleum products under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), except with respect to the export of crude oil or other petroleum products to a foreign person or foreign government subject to sanctions under any provision of United States law, including to a country the government of which is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism.

SEC. 10007. UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c);

(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively;

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c), and moving such subsection after subsection (b), as so redesignated;

(4) in subsection (a), as so redesignated, by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows: “(1) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Commission’) shall have the exclusive authority to approve or deny an application for authorization for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a facility to export natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import natural gas from a foreign country, including an LNG terminal. In determining whether to approve or deny an application under this paragraph, the Commission shall deem the exportation or importation of natural gas to be consistent with the public interest. Except as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act is intended to affect otherwise applicable law related to any Federal agency’s authorities or responsibilities related to facilities to import or export natural gas, including LNG terminals.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the President under the Constitution, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.), the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions on a foreign person or foreign government (including any provision of law that prohibits or restricts United States persons from engaging in a transaction with a sanctioned person or government), including a country that is designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, to prohibit imports or exports.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘state sponsor of terrorism’ means a country the

government of which the Secretary of State determines has repeatedly provided support for international terrorism pursuant to—

“(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4318(c)(1)(A));

“(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(C) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

“(D) any other provision of law.”.

SEC. 10008. PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—The term “Federal authorization” has the meaning given that term in section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717n(a)).

(3) NEPA REVIEW.—The term “NEPA review” means the process of reviewing a proposed Federal action under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(4) PROJECT-RELATED NEPA REVIEW.—The term “project-related NEPA review” means any NEPA review required to be conducted with respect to the issuance of an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act.

(b) COMMISSION NEPA REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES.—In acting as the lead agency under section 15(b)(1) of the Natural Gas Act for the purposes of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall, in accordance with this section and other applicable Federal law—

(1) be the only lead agency;

(2) coordinate as early as practicable with each agency designated as a participating agency under subsection (d)(3) to ensure that the Commission develops information in conducting its project-related NEPA review that is usable by the participating agency in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization for which the agency is responsible; and

(3) take such actions as are necessary and proper to facilitate the expeditious resolution of its project-related NEPA review.

(c) DEFERENCE TO COMMISSION.—In making a decision with respect to a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, each agency shall give deference, to the maximum extent authorized by law, to the scope of the project-related NEPA review that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(d) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission shall identify, not later than 30 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian Tribe that may issue a Federal authorization or is required by Federal law to consult with the Commission in conjunction with the issuance of a Federal authorization required for such authorization or certificate.

(2) INVITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public

convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall invite any agency identified under paragraph (1) to participate in the review process for the applicable Federal authorization.

(B) DEADLINE.—An invitation issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted to the Commission, which may be extended by the Commission for good cause.

(3) DESIGNATION AS PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—Not later than 60 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall designate an agency identified under paragraph (1) as a participating agency with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act unless the agency informs the Commission, in writing, by the deadline established pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the applicable Federal authorization;

(B) has no special expertise or information relevant to any project-related NEPA review; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments for the record for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(4) EFFECT OF NON-DESIGNATION.—

(A) EFFECT ON AGENCY.—Any agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act may not request or conduct a NEPA review that is supplemental to the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, unless the agency—

(i) demonstrates that such review is legally necessary for the agency to carry out responsibilities in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization; and

(ii) requires information that could not have been obtained during the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(B) COMMENTS; RECORD.—The Commission shall not, with respect to an agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act—

(i) consider any comments or other information submitted by such agency for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission; or

(ii) include any such comments or other information in the record for such project-related NEPA review.

(e) WATER QUALITY IMPACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341), an applicant for a Federal authorization shall not be required to provide a certification under such section with respect to the Federal authorization.

(2) COORDINATION.—With respect to any NEPA review for a Federal authorization to conduct an activity that will directly result in a discharge into the navigable waters (within the meaning of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act), the Commission shall identify as an agency under subsection (d)(1) the State in which the discharge originates or will originate, or, if appropriate, the interstate water pollution control agency having jurisdiction over the navigable

waters at the point where the discharge originates or will originate.

(3) PROPOSED CONDITIONS.—A State or interstate agency designated as a participating agency pursuant to paragraph (2) may propose to the Commission terms or conditions for inclusion in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that the State or interstate agency determines are necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(4) COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONS.—The Commission may include a term or condition in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act proposed by a State or interstate agency under paragraph (3) only if the Commission finds that the term or condition is necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(f) SCHEDULE.—

(1) DEADLINE FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A deadline for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act set by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act shall be not later than 90 days after the Commission completes its project-related NEPA review, unless an applicable schedule is otherwise established by Federal law.

(2) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal and State agency—

(A) that may consider an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act shall formulate and implement a plan for administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of Federal authorizations in compliance with schedules established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act; and

(B) in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, shall—

(i) formulate and implement a plan to enable the agency to comply with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act;

(ii) carry out the obligations of that agency under applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction with, the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, and in compliance with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act, unless the agency notifies the Commission in writing that doing so would impair the ability of the agency to conduct needed analysis or otherwise carry out such obligations;

(iii) transmit to the Commission a statement—

(I) acknowledging receipt of the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act; and

(II) setting forth the plan formulated under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

(iv) not later than 30 days after the agency receives such application for a Federal authorization, transmit to the applicant a notice—

(I) indicating whether such application is ready for processing; and

(II) if such application is not ready for processing, that includes a comprehensive description of the information needed for the agency to determine that the application is ready for processing;

(v) determine that such application for a Federal authorization is ready for processing for purposes of clause (iv) if such application is sufficiently complete for the purposes of commencing consideration, regardless of whether supplemental information is necessary to enable the agency to complete the consideration required by law with respect to such application; and

(vi) not less often than once every 90 days, transmit to the Commission a report describing the progress made in considering such application for a Federal authorization.

(3) **FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.**—If a Federal or State agency, including the Commission, fails to meet a deadline for a Federal authorization set forth in the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act, not later than 5 days after such deadline, the head of the relevant Federal agency (including, in the case of a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority) shall notify Congress and the Commission of such failure and set forth a recommended implementation plan to ensure completion of the action to which such deadline applied.

(g) **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.**—

(1) **ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.**—

(A) **IDENTIFICATION.**—Federal and State agencies that may consider an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization shall identify, as early as possible, any issues of concern that may delay or prevent an agency from working with the Commission to resolve such issues and granting such authorization.

(B) **ISSUE RESOLUTION.**—The Commission may forward any issue of concern identified under subparagraph (A) to the heads of the relevant agencies (including, in the case of an issue of concern that is a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority, if applicable) for resolution.

(2) **REMOTE SURVEYS.**—If a Federal or State agency considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization requires the person applying for such authorization to submit data, the agency shall consider any such data gathered by aerial or other remote means that the person submits. The agency may grant a conditional approval for the Federal authorization based on data gathered by aerial or remote means, conditioned on the verification of such data by subsequent onsite inspection.

(3) **APPLICATION PROCESSING.**—The Commission, and Federal and State agencies, may allow a person applying for a Federal authorization to fund a third-party contractor to assist in reviewing the application for such authorization.

(h) **ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, EFFICIENCY.**—For an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that requires multiple Federal authorizations, the Commission, with input from any Federal or State agency considering an aspect of the application, shall track and make available to the public on the Commission's website information related to the actions required to

complete the Federal authorizations. Such information shall include the following:

(1) The schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act.

(2) A list of all the actions required by each applicable agency to complete permitting, reviews, and other actions necessary to obtain a final decision on the application.

(3) The expected completion date for each such action.

(4) A point of contact at the agency responsible for each such action.

(5) In the event that an action is still pending as of the expected date of completion, a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

(i) **PIPELINE SECURITY.**—In considering an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall consult with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration regarding the applicant's compliance with security guidance and best practice recommendations of the Administration regarding pipeline infrastructure security, pipeline cybersecurity, pipeline personnel security, and other pipeline security measures.

SEC. 10009. INTERIM HAZARDOUS WASTE PERMITS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

Section 3005(e) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6925(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “or” after “this section,”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) is a critical energy resource facility,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this subsection:

“(A) **CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.**—The term ‘critical energy resource’ means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

“(i) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

“(ii) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

“(B) **CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.**—The term ‘critical energy resource facility’ means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.”.

SEC. 10010. FLEXIBLE AIR PERMITS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, as necessary, revise regulations under parts 70 and 71 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to—

(1) authorize the owner or operator of a critical energy resource facility to utilize flexible air permitting (as described in the final rule titled “Operating Permit Programs; Flexible Air Permitting Rule” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 6, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 51418)) with respect to such critical energy resource facility; and

(2) facilitate flexible, market-responsive operations (as described in the final rule identified in paragraph (1)) with respect to critical energy resource facilities.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.**—The term “critical energy resource” means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

(A) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

(B) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

(2) **CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.**—The term “critical energy resource facility” means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.

SEC. 10011. NATIONAL SECURITY OR ENERGY SECURITY WAIVERS TO PRODUCE CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.

(a) **CLEAN AIR ACT REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, determines that, by reason of a sudden increase in demand for, or a shortage of, a critical energy resource, or another cause, the processing or refining of a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility is necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs of the United States, then the Administrator may, with or without notice, hearing, or other report, issue a temporary waiver of any requirement under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) with respect to such critical energy resource facility that, in the judgment of the Administrator, will allow for such processing or refining at such critical energy resource facility as necessary to best meet such needs and serve the public interest.

(2) **CONFLICT WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.**—The Administrator shall ensure that any waiver of a requirement under the Clean Air Act under this subsection, to the maximum extent practicable, does not result in a conflict with a requirement of any other applicable Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation and minimizes any adverse environmental impacts.

(3) **VIOLATIONS OF OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.**—To the extent any omission or action taken by a party under a waiver issued under this subsection is in conflict with any requirement of a Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

(4) **EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.**—A waiver issued under this subsection shall expire not later than 90 days after it is issued. The Administrator may renew or reissue such waiver pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 90 days for each period, as the Administrator determines necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs described in paragraph (1) and serve the public interest. In renewing or reissuing a waiver under this paragraph, the Administrator shall include in any such renewed or reissued waiver such conditions as are necessary to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

(5) **SUBSEQUENT ACTION BY COURT.**—If a waiver issued under this subsection is subsequently stayed, modified, or set aside by a court pursuant to a provision of law, any omission or action previously taken by a party under the waiver while the waiver was in effect shall remain subject to paragraph (3).

(6) **CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE; CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY DEFINED.**—The terms “critical energy resource” and “critical energy resource facility” have the meanings given such terms in section 3025(f) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as added by this section).

(b) **SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT.**—The Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 3024 the following:

“SEC. 3025. WAIVERS FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITIES.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy,

determines that, by reason of a sudden increase in demand for, or a shortage of, a critical energy resource, or another cause, the processing or refining of a critical energy resource at a critical energy resource facility is necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs of the United States, then the Administrator may, with or without notice, hearing, or other report, issue a temporary waiver of any covered requirement with respect to such critical energy resource facility that, in the judgment of the Administrator, will allow for such processing or refining at such critical energy resource facility as necessary to best meet such needs and serve the public interest.

“(b) CONFLICT WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The Administrator shall ensure that any waiver of a covered requirement under this section, to the maximum extent practicable, does not result in a conflict with a requirement of any other applicable Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation and minimizes any adverse environmental impacts.

“(c) VIOLATIONS OF OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—To the extent any omission or action taken by a party under a waiver issued under this section is in conflict with any requirement of a Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

“(d) EXPIRATION AND RENEWAL OF WAIVERS.—A waiver issued under this section shall expire not later than 90 days after it is issued. The Administrator may renew or reissue such waiver pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 90 days for each period, as the Administrator determines necessary to meet the national security or energy security needs described in subsection (a) and serve the public interest. In renewing or reissuing a waiver under this subsection, the Administrator shall include in any such renewed or reissued waiver such conditions as are necessary to minimize any adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

“(e) SUBSEQUENT ACTION BY COURT.—If a waiver issued under this section is subsequently stayed, modified, or set aside by a court pursuant to a provision of law, any omission or action previously taken by a party under the waiver while the waiver was in effect shall remain subject to subsection (c).

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
“(1) COVERED REQUIREMENT.—The term ‘covered requirement’ means—

“(A) any standard established under section 3002, 3003, or 3004;

“(B) the permit requirement under section 3005; or

“(C) any other requirement of this Act, as the Administrator determines appropriate.

“(2) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term ‘critical energy resource’ means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

“(A) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and
“(B) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.

“(3) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCE FACILITY.—The term ‘critical energy resource facility’ means a facility that processes or refines a critical energy resource.”.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3024 the following:

“Sec. 3025. Waivers for critical energy resource facilities.”.

SEC. 10012. ENDING FUTURE DELAYS IN CHEMICAL SUBSTANCE REVIEW FOR CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.

Section 5(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2604(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) CRITICAL ENERGY RESOURCES.—

“(A) STANDARD.—For purposes of a determination under paragraph (3) with respect to a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource, the Administrator shall take into consideration economic, societal, and environmental costs and benefits, notwithstanding any requirement of this section to not take such factors into consideration.

“(B) FAILURE TO RENDER DETERMINATION.—

“(i) ACTIONS AUTHORIZED.—If, with respect to a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource, the Administrator fails to make a determination on a notice under paragraph (3) by the end of the applicable review period and the notice has not been withdrawn by the submitter, the submitter may take the actions described in paragraph (1)(A) with respect to the chemical substance, and the Administrator shall be relieved of any requirement to make such determination.

“(ii) NON-DUPLICATION.—A refund of applicable fees under paragraph (4)(A) shall not be made if a submitter takes an action described in paragraph (1)(A) under this subsection.

“(C) PREREQUISITE FOR SUGGESTION OF WITHDRAWAL OR SUSPENSION.—The Administrator may not suggest to, or request of, a submitter of a notice under this subsection for a chemical substance that is a critical energy resource that such submitter withdraw such notice, or request a suspension of the running of the applicable review period with respect to such notice, unless the Administrator has—

“(i) conducted a preliminary review of such notice; and

“(ii) provided to the submitter a draft of a determination under paragraph (3), including any supporting information.

“(D) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘critical energy resource’ means, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, any energy resource—

“(i) that is essential to the energy sector and energy systems of the United States; and

“(ii) the supply chain of which is vulnerable to disruption.”.

SEC. 10013. NATURAL GAS TAX REPEAL.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 136 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7436) (relating to methane emissions and waste reduction incentive program for petroleum and natural gas systems) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION.—The unobligated balance of any amounts made available under section 136 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7436) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) is rescinded.

SEC. 10014. REPEAL OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION FUND.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 134 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7434) (relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION.—The unobligated balance of any amounts made available under section 134 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7434) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) is rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 60103 of Public Law 117–169 (relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund) is repealed.

SEC. 10015. KEEPING AMERICA'S REFINERIES OPERATING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The owner or operator of a stationary source described in subsection (b) of this section shall not be required by the regulations promulgated under section 112(r)(7)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C.

7412(r)(7)(B)) to include in any hazard assessment under clause (ii) of such section 112(r)(7)(B) an assessment of safer technology and alternative risk management measures with respect to the use of hydrofluoric acid in an alkylation unit.

(b) STATIONARY SOURCE DESCRIBED.—A stationary source described in this subsection is a stationary source (as defined in section 112(r)(2)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(2)(C))) in North American Industry Classification System code 324—

(1) for which a construction permit or operating permit has been issued pursuant to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); or

(2) for which the owner or operator demonstrates to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that such stationary source conforms or will conform to the most recent version of American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practice 751.

SEC. 10016. HOMEOWNER ENERGY FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following are repealed:

(1) Section 50122 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a) (relating to a high-efficiency electric home rebate program).

(2) Section 50123 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795b) (relating to State-based home energy efficiency contractor training grants).

(3) Section 50131 of Public Law 117–169 (136 Stat. 2041) (relating to assistance for latest and zero building energy code adoption).

(b) RESCISSIONS.—The unobligated balances of any amounts made available under each of sections 50122, 50123, and 50131 of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795a, 18795b; 136 Stat. 2041) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) are rescinded.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 50121(c)(7) of Public Law 117–169 (42 U.S.C. 18795(c)(7)) is amended by striking “, including a rebate provided under a high-efficiency electric home rebate program (as defined in section 50122(d)),”.

DIVISION B—TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, PERMITTING, AND PRODUCTION OF AMERICAN RESOURCES

SEC. 20001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Transparency, Accountability, Permitting, and Production of American Resources Act” or the “TAPP American Resources Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

DIVISION B—TAPP AMERICAN RESOURCES

Sec. 20001. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE LEASING AND OVERSIGHT

Sec. 20101. Onshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20102. Lease reinstatement.

Sec. 20103. Protested lease sales.

Sec. 20104. Suspension of operations.

Sec. 20105. Administrative protest process reform.

Sec. 20106. Leasing and permitting transparency.

Sec. 20107. Offshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20108. Five-year plan for offshore oil and gas leasing.

Sec. 20109. Geothermal leasing.

Sec. 20110. Leasing for certain qualified coal applications.

Sec. 20111. Future coal leasing.

Sec. 20112. Staff planning report.

Sec. 20113. Prohibition on Chinese communist party ownership interest.

Sec. 20114. Effect on other law.

TITLE II—PERMITTING STREAMLINING

Sec. 20201. Definitions.

Sec. 20202. BUILDER Act.

- Sec. 20203. Codification of National Environmental Policy Act regulations.
- Sec. 20204. Non-major Federal actions.
- Sec. 20205. No net loss determination for existing rights-of-way.
- Sec. 20206. Determination of National Environmental Policy Act adequacy.
- Sec. 20207. Determination regarding rights-of-way.
- Sec. 20208. Terms of rights-of-way.
- Sec. 20209. Funding to process permits and develop information technology.
- Sec. 20210. Offshore geological and geophysical survey licensing.
- Sec. 20211. Deferral of applications for permits to drill.
- Sec. 20212. Processing and terms of applications for permits to drill.
- Sec. 20213. Amendments to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.
- Sec. 20214. Access to Federal energy resources from non-Federal surface estate.
- Sec. 20215. Scope of environmental reviews for oil and gas leases.
- Sec. 20216. Expediting approval of gathering lines.
- Sec. 20217. Lease sale litigation.
- Sec. 20218. Limitation on claims.
- Sec. 20219. Government Accountability Office report on permits to drill.
- Sec. 20220. E-NEPA.

TITLE III—PERMITTING FOR MINING NEEDS

- Sec. 20301. Definitions.
- Sec. 20302. Minerals supply chain and reliability.
- Sec. 20303. Federal register process improvement.
- Sec. 20304. Designation of mining as a covered sector for Federal permitting improvement purposes.
- Sec. 20305. Treatment of actions under presidential determination 2022-11 for Federal permitting improvement purposes.
- Sec. 20306. Notice for mineral exploration activities with limited surface disturbance.
- Sec. 20307. Use of mining claims for ancillary activities.
- Sec. 20308. Ensuring consideration of uranium as a critical mineral.
- Sec. 20309. Barring foreign bad actors from operating on Federal lands.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING

- Sec. 20401. Federal land use planning and withdrawals.
- Sec. 20402. Prohibitions on delay of mineral development of certain Federal land.
- Sec. 20403. Definitions.

TITLE V—ENSURING COMPETITIVENESS ON FEDERAL LANDS

- Sec. 20501. Incentivizing domestic production.

TITLE VI—ENERGY REVENUE SHARING

- Sec. 20601. Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf revenue.
- Sec. 20602. Parity in offshore wind revenue sharing.
- Sec. 20603. Elimination of administrative fee under the Mineral Leasing Act.

TITLE I—ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE LEASING AND OVERSIGHT

SEC. 20101. ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO IMMEDIATELY RESUME ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall immediately resume quarterly onshore oil and gas lease sales in compliance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure—

(A) that any oil and gas lease sale pursuant to paragraph (1) is conducted immediately on completion of all applicable scoping, public comment, and environmental analysis requirements under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) that the processes described in subparagraph (A) are conducted in a timely manner to ensure compliance with subsection (b)(1).

(3) LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LANDS.—Section 17(b)(1)(A) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “Eligible lands comprise all lands subject to leasing under this Act and not excluded from leasing by a statutory or regulatory prohibition. Available lands are those lands that have been designated as open for leasing under a land use plan developed under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and that have been nominated for leasing through the submission of an expression of interest, are subject to drainage in the absence of leasing, or are otherwise designated as available pursuant to regulations adopted by the Secretary.” after “sales are necessary.”.

(b) QUARTERLY LEASE SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a minimum of four oil and gas lease sales in each of the following States:

- (A) Wyoming.
- (B) New Mexico.
- (C) Colorado.
- (D) Utah.
- (E) Montana.
- (F) North Dakota.
- (G) Oklahoma.
- (H) Nevada.
- (I) Alaska.

(J) Any other State in which there is land available for oil and gas leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or any other mineral leasing law.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting a lease sale under paragraph (1) in a State described in that paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer all parcels nominated and eligible pursuant to the requirements of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) for oil and gas exploration, development, and production under the resource management plan in effect for the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT SALES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a replacement sale during the same fiscal year if—

(A) a lease sale under paragraph (1) is canceled, delayed, or deferred, including for a lack of eligible parcels; or

(B) during a lease sale under paragraph (1) the percentage of acreage that does not receive a bid is equal to or greater than 25 percent of the acreage offered.

(4) NOTICE REGARDING MISSED SALES.—Not later than 30 days after a sale required under this subsection is canceled, delayed, deferred, or otherwise missed the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that states what sale was missed and why it was missed.

SEC. 20102. LEASE REINSTATEMENT.

The reinstatement of a lease entered into under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) by the Secretary shall be not considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

SEC. 20103. PROTESTED LEASE SALES.

Section 17(b)(1)(A) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “The Secretary shall resolve any protest to a lease sale not later than 60 days after such payment.” after “annual rental for the first lease year.”.

SEC. 20104. SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(r) SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS PERMITS.—In the event that an oil and gas lease owner has submitted an expression of interest for adjacent acreage that is part of the nature of the geological play and has yet to be offered in a lease sale by the Secretary, they may request a suspension of operations from the Secretary of the Interior and upon request, the Secretary shall grant the suspension of operations within 15 days. Any payment of acreage rental or of minimum royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operations and production; and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding any such suspension period thereto.”.

SEC. 20105. ADMINISTRATIVE PROTEST PROCESS REFORM.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) PROTEST FILING FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before processing any protest filed under this section, the Secretary shall collect a filing fee in the amount described in paragraph (2) from the protestor to recover the cost for processing documents filed for each administrative protest.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The amount described in this paragraph is calculated as follows:

“(A) For each protest filed in a submission not exceeding 10 pages in length, the base filing fee shall be \$150.

“(B) For each submission exceeding 10 pages in length, in addition to the base filing fee, an assessment of \$5 per page in excess of 10 pages shall apply.

“(C) For protests that include more than one oil and gas lease parcel, right-of-way, or application for permit to drill in a submission, an additional assessment of \$10 per additional lease parcel, right-of-way, or application for permit to drill shall apply.

“(3) ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on January 1, 2024, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall adjust the filing fees established in this subsection to whole dollar amounts to reflect changes in the Producer Price Index, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the previous 12 months.

“(B) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED FILING FEES.—At least 30 days before the filing fees as adjusted under this paragraph take effect, the Secretary shall publish notification of the adjustment of such fees in the Federal Register.”.

SEC. 20106. LEASING AND PERMITTING TRANSPARENCY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the status of nominated parcels for future onshore oil and gas and geothermal lease sales, including—

(A) the number of expressions of interest received each month during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted with respect to which the Bureau of Land Management—

(i) has not taken any action to review;

(ii) has not completed review; or
 (iii) has completed review and determined that the relevant area meets all applicable requirements for leasing, but has not offered the relevant area in a lease sale;

(B) how long expressions of interest described in subparagraph (A) have been pending; and

(C) a plan, including timelines, for how the Secretary of the Interior plans to—

(i) work through future expressions of interest to prevent delays;

(ii) put expressions of interest described in subparagraph (A) into a lease sale; and

(iii) complete review for expressions of interest described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A);

(2) the status of each pending application for permit to drill received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Land Management office, including—

(A) a description of the cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending in violation of section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2)); and

(C) a plan for how the office intends to come into compliance with the requirements of section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2));

(3) the number of permits to drill issued each month by each Bureau of Land Management office during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted;

(4) the status of each pending application for a license for offshore geological and geophysical surveys received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Ocean Energy management regional office, including—

(A) a description of any cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending; and

(C) a plan for how the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management intends to complete review of each application;

(5) the number of licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys issued each month by each Bureau of Ocean Energy Management regional office during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted;

(6) the status of each pending application for a permit to drill received during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, including the number of applications received each month, by each Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement regional office, including—

(A) a description of any cause of delay for pending applications, including as a result of staffing shortages, technical limitations, incomplete applications, and incomplete review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws;

(B) the number of days an application has been pending; and

(C) steps the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement is taking to complete review of each application;

(7) the number of permits to drill issued each month by each Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement regional office during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted;

(8) how, as applicable, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement determines whether to—

(A) issue a license for geological and geophysical surveys;

(B) issue a permit to drill; and

(C) issue, extend, or suspend an oil and gas lease;

(9) when determinations described in paragraph (8) are sent to the national office of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement for final approval;

(10) the degree to which Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement field, State, and regional offices exercise discretion on such final approval;

(11) during the period of 365 days that ends on the date on which the report is submitted, the number of auctioned leases receiving accepted bids that have not been issued to winning bidders and the number of days such leases have not been issued; and

(12) a description of the uses of application for permit to drill fees paid by permit holders during the 5-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted.

(B) PENDING APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) complete all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable law that must be met before issuance of a permit to drill described in paragraph (2); and

(2) issue a permit for all completed applications to drill that are pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

(1) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

“(1) EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending, approved, and not approved expressions of interest in nominated parcels for future onshore oil and gas lease sales in the preceding month.

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for permits to drill in the preceding month in each State office.

“(3) PAST DATA.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior, with respect to each month during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this subsection—

“(A) the number of approved and not approved expressions of interest for onshore oil and gas lease sales during such 5-year period; and

“(B) the number of approved and not approved applications for permits to drill during such 5-year period.”.

(2) OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.—Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.—

“(1) OFFSHORE GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY LICENSES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys in the preceding month.

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and each month thereafter, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior the number of pending and approved applications for permits to drill on the outer Continental Shelf in the preceding month in each regional office.

“(3) PAST DATA.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish on the website of the Department of the Interior, with respect each month during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this subsection—

“(A) the number of approved applications for licenses for offshore geological and geophysical surveys; and

“(B) the number of approved applications for permits to drill on the outer Continental Shelf.”.

(d) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives all documents and communications relating to the comprehensive review of Federal oil and gas permitting and leasing practices required under section 208 of Executive Order 14008 (86 Fed. Reg. 7624; relating to tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The submission under paragraph (1) shall include all documents and communications submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by members of the public in response to any public meeting or forum relating to the comprehensive review described in that paragraph.

SEC. 20107. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct all lease sales described in the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016) that have not been conducted as of the date of the enactment of this Act by not later than September 30, 2023.

(b) GULF OF MEXICO REGION ANNUAL LEASE SALES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except within areas subject to existing oil and gas leasing moratoria beginning in fiscal year 2023, the Secretary of the Interior shall annually conduct a minimum of 2 region-wide oil and gas lease sales in the following planning areas of the Gulf of Mexico region, as described in the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016):

(1) The Central Gulf of Mexico Planning Area.

(2) The Western Gulf of Mexico Planning Area.

(c) ALASKA REGION ANNUAL LEASE SALES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning in fiscal year 2023, the Secretary of the Interior shall annually conduct a minimum of 2 region-wide oil and gas lease sales in the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf, as described in the 2017–2022

Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016).

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting lease sales under subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) issue such leases in accordance with the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1332 et seq.); and

(2) include in each such lease sale all unleased areas that are not subject to a moratorium as of the date of the lease sale.

SEC. 20108. FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING.

Section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “subsections (c) and (d) of this section, shall prepare and periodically revise,” and inserting “this section, shall issue every five years”;;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) Each five-year program shall include at least two Gulf of Mexico region-wide lease sales per year.”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting “domestic energy security,” after “between”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (i) as subsections (h) through (k), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM FOR 2023–2028.—The Secretary shall issue the five-year oil and gas leasing program for 2023 through 2028 and issue the Record of Decision on the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement by not later than July 1, 2023.

“(g) SUBSEQUENT LEASING PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 36 months after conducting the first lease sale under an oil and gas leasing program prepared pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall begin preparing the subsequent oil and gas leasing program under this section.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—Each subsequent oil and gas leasing program under this section shall be approved by not later than 180 days before the expiration of the previous oil and gas leasing program.”.

SEC. 20109. GEOTHERMAL LEASING.

(a) ANNUAL LEASING.—Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “2 years” and inserting “year”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) after paragraph (2), by inserting the following:

“(3) REPLACEMENT SALES.—If a lease sale under paragraph (1) for a year is canceled or delayed, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a replacement sale during the same year.

“(4) REQUIREMENT.—In conducting a lease sale under paragraph (2) in a State described in that paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer all nominated parcels eligible for geothermal development and utilization under the resource management plan in effect for the State.”.

(b) DEADLINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF GEOTHERMAL DRILLING PERMITS.—Section 4 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) DEADLINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF GEOTHERMAL DRILLING PERMITS.—

“(1) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an application for any geothermal drilling permit, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide written notice to the applicant that the application is complete; or

“(B) notify the applicant that information is missing and specify any information that is required to be submitted for the application to be complete.

“(2) ISSUANCE OF DECISION.—If the Secretary determines that an application for a geothermal drilling permit is complete under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall issue a final decision on the application not later than 30 days after the Secretary notifies the applicant that the application is complete.”.

SEC. 20110. LEASING FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED COAL APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COAL LEASE.—The term “coal lease” means a lease entered into by the United States as lessor, through the Bureau of Land Management, and the applicant on Bureau of Land Management Form 3400-012.

(2) QUALIFIED APPLICATION.—The term “qualified application” means any application pending under the lease by application program administered by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and subpart 3425 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), for which the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) has commenced.

(b) MANDATORY LEASING AND OTHER REQUIRED APPROVALS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promptly—

(1) with respect to each qualified application—

(A) if not previously published for public comment, publish a draft environmental assessment, as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and any applicable implementing regulations;

(B) finalize the fair market value of the coal tract for which a lease by application is pending;

(C) take all intermediate actions necessary to grant the qualified application; and

(D) grant the qualified application; and

(2) with respect to previously awarded coal leases, grant any additional approvals of the Department of the Interior or any bureau, agency, or division of the Department of the Interior required for mining activities to commence.

SEC. 20111. FUTURE COAL LEASING.

Notwithstanding any judicial decision to the contrary or a departmental review of the Federal coal leasing program, Secretarial Order 3338, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on January 15, 2016, shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 20112. STAFF PLANNING REPORT.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the staffing capacity of each respective agency with respect to issuing oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits. Each such report shall include—

(1) the number of staff assigned to process and issue oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits;

(2) a description of how many staff are needed to meet statutory requirements for such oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits; and

(3) how, as applicable, the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture plans to address staffing shortfalls and turnover to ensure adequate staffing to process and issue such oil, gas, hardrock mining, coal, and renewable energy leases, rights-of-way, claims, easements, and permits.

SEC. 20113. PROHIBITION ON CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY OWNERSHIP INTEREST.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Communist Party of China (or a person acting on behalf of the Community Party of China) may not acquire any interest with respect to lands leased for oil or gas under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.).

SEC. 20114. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

Nothing in this division, or any amendments made by this division, shall affect—

(1) the Presidential memorandum titled “Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition” and dated September 8, 2020;

(2) the Presidential memorandum titled “Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition” and dated September 25, 2020;

(3) the Presidential memorandum titled “Memorandum on Withdrawal of Certain Areas off the Atlantic Coast on the Outer Continental Shelf From Leasing Disposition” and dated December 20, 2016; or

(4) the ban on oil and gas development in the Great Lakes described in section 386 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15941).

TITLE II—PERMITTING STREAMLINING

SEC. 20201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ENERGY FACILITY.—The term “energy facility” means a facility the primary purpose of which is the exploration for, or the development, production, conversion, gathering, storage, transfer, processing, or transportation of, any energy resource.

(2) ENERGY STORAGE DEVICE.—The term “energy storage device”—

(A) means any equipment that stores energy, including electricity, compressed air, pumped water, heat, and hydrogen, which may be converted into, or used to produce, electricity; and

(B) includes a battery, regenerative fuel cell, flywheel, capacitor, superconducting magnet, and any other equipment the Secretary concerned determines may be used to store energy which may be converted into, or used to produce, electricity.

(3) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term “public lands” means any land and interest in land owned by the United States within the several States and administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture without regard to how the United States acquired ownership, except—

(A) lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf; and

(B) lands held in trust by the United States for the benefit of Indians, Indian Tribes, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

(4) RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The term “right-of-way” means—

(A) a right-of-way issued, granted, or renewed under section 501 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761); or

(B) a right-of-way granted under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185).

(5) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to public lands, the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) with respect to National Forest System lands, the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) LAND USE PLAN.—The term “land use plan” means—

(A) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of

the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604);

(B) a Land Management Plan developed by the Bureau of Land Management under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

(C) a comprehensive conservation plan developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under section 4(e)(1)(A) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(e)(1)(A)).

SEC. 20202. BUILDER ACT.

(a) PARAGRAPH (2) OF SECTION 102.—Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act and except as provided by other provisions of law,” before “include in every”;

(B) by striking clauses (i) through (v) and inserting the following:

“(i) reasonably foreseeable environmental effects with a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed agency action;

“(ii) any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

“(iii) a reasonable number of alternatives to the proposed agency action, including an analysis of any negative environmental impacts of not implementing the proposed agency action in the case of a no action alternative, that are technically and economically feasible, are within the jurisdiction of the agency, meet the purpose and need of the proposal, and, where applicable, meet the goals of the applicant;

“(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

“(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of Federal resources which would be involved in the proposed agency action should it be implemented.”; and

(C) by striking “the responsible Federal official” and inserting “the head of the lead agency”;

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking “Any” and inserting “any”;

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (I) as subparagraphs (F) through (K), respectively;

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document;

“(E) make use of reliable existing data and resources in carrying out this Act;”;

(7) by amending subparagraph (G), as redesignated, to read as follows:

“(G) consistent with the provisions of this Act, study, develop, and describe technically and economically feasible alternatives within the jurisdiction and authority of the agency;”;

(8) in subparagraph (H), as amended, by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act,” before “recognize”.

(b) NEW SECTIONS.—Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 106. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW.

“(a) THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.—An agency is not required to prepare an environmental document with respect to a proposed agency action if—

“(1) the proposed agency action is not a final agency action within the meaning of such term in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) the proposed agency action is covered by a categorical exclusion established by the agency, another Federal agency, or another provision of law;

“(3) the preparation of such document would clearly and fundamentally conflict with the requirements of another provision of law;

“(4) the proposed agency action is, in whole or in part, a nondiscretionary action with respect to which such agency does not have authority to take environmental factors into consideration in determining whether to take the proposed action;

“(5) the proposed agency action is a rule-making that is subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code; or

“(6) the proposed agency action is an action for which such agency’s compliance with another statute’s requirements serve the same or similar function as the requirements of this Act with respect to such action.

“(b) LEVELS OF REVIEW.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action that has a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—An agency shall prepare an environmental assessment with respect to a proposed agency action that is not likely to have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, or if the significance of such effect is unknown, unless the agency finds that a categorical exclusion established by the agency, another Federal agency, or another provision of law applies. Such environmental assessment shall be a concise public document prepared by a Federal agency to set forth the basis of such agency’s finding of no significant impact.

“(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In making a determination under this subsection, an agency—

“(A) may make use of any reliable data source; and

“(B) is not required to undertake new scientific or technical research.

“SEC. 107. TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.

“(a) LEAD AGENCY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If there are two or more involved Federal agencies, such agencies shall determine, by letter or memorandum, which agency shall be the lead agency based on consideration of the following factors:

“(i) Magnitude of agency’s involvement.

“(ii) Project approval or disapproval authority.

“(iii) Expertise concerning the action’s environmental effects.

“(iv) Duration of agency’s involvement.

“(v) Sequence of agency’s involvement.

“(B) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the involved Federal agencies may, in addition to a Federal agency, appoint such Federal, State, Tribal, or local agencies as joint lead agencies as the involved Federal agencies shall determine appropriate. Joint lead agencies shall jointly fulfill the role described in paragraph (2).

“(C) MINERAL PROJECTS.—This paragraph shall not apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit.

“(2) ROLE.—A lead agency shall, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) supervise the preparation of an environmental document if, with respect to such proposed agency action, there is more than one involved Federal agency;

“(B) request the participation of each cooperating agency at the earliest practicable time;

“(C) in preparing an environmental document, give consideration to any analysis or proposal created by a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law or a cooperating agency with special expertise;

“(D) develop a schedule, in consultation with each involved cooperating agency, the applicant, and such other entities as the lead agency determines appropriate, for completion of any environmental review, permit, or authorization required to carry out the proposed agency action;

“(E) if the lead agency determines that a review, permit, or authorization will not be completed in accordance with the schedule developed under subparagraph (D), notify the agency responsible for issuing such review, permit, or authorization of the discrepancy and request that such agency take such measures as such agency determines appropriate to comply with such schedule; and

“(F) meet with a cooperating agency that requests such a meeting.

“(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The lead agency may, with respect to a proposed agency action, designate any involved Federal agency or a State, Tribal, or local agency as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency may, not later than a date specified by the lead agency, submit comments to the lead agency. Such comments shall be limited to matters relating to the proposed agency action with respect to which such agency has special expertise or jurisdiction by law with respect to an environmental issue.

“(4) REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION.—Any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency with respect to a proposed agency action under paragraph (1) may submit a written request for such a designation to an involved Federal agency. An agency that receives a request under this paragraph shall transmit such request to each involved Federal agency and to the Council.

“(5) COUNCIL DESIGNATION.—

“(A) REQUEST.—Not earlier than 45 days after the date on which a request is submitted under paragraph (4), if no designation has been made under paragraph (1), a Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency may request that the Council designate a lead agency. Such request shall consist of—

“(i) a precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) a detailed statement with respect to each involved Federal agency and each factor listed in paragraph (1) regarding which agency should serve as lead agency.

“(B) TRANSMISSION.—The Council shall transmit a request received under subparagraph (A) to each involved Federal agency.

“(C) RESPONSE.—An involved Federal agency may, not later than 20 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), submit to the Council a response to such request.

“(D) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 40 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), the Council shall designate the lead agency with respect to the relevant proposed agency action.

“(b) ONE DOCUMENT.—

“(1) DOCUMENT.—To the extent practicable, if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to a proposed agency action and the lead agency has determined that an environmental document is required, such requirement shall be deemed satisfied with respect to all involved Federal agencies if the lead agency issues such an environmental document.

“(2) CONSIDERATION TIMING.—In developing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, no involved Federal agency shall be required to consider any information that becomes available after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(A) receipt of a complete application with respect to such proposed agency action; or

“(B) publication of a notice of intent or decision to prepare an environmental impact statement for such proposed agency action.

“(3) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In developing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, the lead agency and any other involved Federal agencies shall only consider the effects of the proposed agency action that—

“(A) occur on Federal land; or

“(B) are subject to Federal control and responsibility.

“(c) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement under section 102 shall include a request for public comment on alternatives or impacts and on relevant information, studies, or analyses with respect to the proposed agency action.

“(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Each environmental impact statement shall include a statement of purpose and need that briefly summarizes the underlying purpose and need for the proposed agency action.

“(e) ESTIMATED TOTAL COST.—The cover sheet for each environmental impact statement shall include a statement of the estimated total cost of preparing such environmental impact statement, including the costs of agency full-time equivalent personnel hours, contractor costs, and other direct costs.

“(f) PAGE LIMITS.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an environmental impact statement shall not exceed 150 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(B) EXTRAORDINARY COMPLEXITY.—An environmental impact statement for a proposed agency action of extraordinary complexity shall not exceed 300 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—An environmental assessment shall not exceed 75 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(g) SPONSOR PREPARATION.—A lead agency shall allow a project sponsor to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement upon request of the project sponsor. Such agency may provide such sponsor with appropriate guidance and assist in the preparation. The lead agency shall independently evaluate the environmental document and shall take responsibility for the contents upon adoption.

“(h) DEADLINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to a proposed agency action, a lead agency shall complete, as applicable—

“(A) the environmental impact statement not later than the date that is 2 years after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 102(2)(C) requires the issuance of an environmental impact statement with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for such action; and

“(B) the environmental assessment not later than the date that is 1 year after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 106(b)(2) requires the preparation of an environmental assessment with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment for such action.

“(2) DELAY.—A lead agency that determines it is not able to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) may extend such deadline with the approval of the applicant. If the applicant approves such an extension, the lead agency shall establish a new deadline that provides only so much additional time as is necessary to complete such environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

“(3) EXPENDITURES FOR DELAY.—If a lead agency is unable to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) or extended under paragraph (2), the lead agency must pay \$100 per day, to the extent funding is provided in advance in an appropriations Act, out of the office of the head of the department of the lead agency to the applicant starting on the first day immediately following the deadline described in paragraph (1) or extended under paragraph (2) up until the date that an applicant approves a new deadline. This paragraph does not apply when the lead agency misses a deadline solely due to delays caused by litigation.

“(i) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each lead agency shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

“(A) identifies any environmental assessment and environmental impact statement that such lead agency did not complete by the deadline described in subsection (h); and

“(B) provides an explanation for any failure to meet such deadline.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify, as applicable—

“(A) the office, bureau, division, unit, or other entity within the Federal agency responsible for each such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement;

“(B) the date on which—

“(i) such lead agency notified the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for the major Federal action is complete;

“(ii) such lead agency began the scoping for the major Federal action; or

“(iii) such lead agency issued a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the major Federal action; and

“(C) when such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement is expected to be complete.

“SEC. 108. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“(a) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of compliance with this Act, of a determination made under this Act, or of Federal action resulting from a determination made under this Act, shall be barred unless—

“(1) in the case of a claim pertaining to a proposed agency action for which—

“(A) an environmental document was prepared and an opportunity for comment was provided;

“(B) the claim is filed by a party that participated in the administrative proceedings regarding such environmental document; and

“(C) the claim—

“(i) is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the public comment period for such administrative proceedings and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the lead agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review; and

“(ii) is related to such comment;

“(2) except as provided in subsection (b), such claim is filed not later than 120 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register of agency intent to carry out the proposed agency action;

“(3) such claim is filed after the issuance of a record of decision or other final agency action with respect to the relevant proposed agency action;

“(4) such claim does not challenge the establishment or use of a categorical exclusion under section 102; and

“(5) such claim concerns—

“(A) an alternative included in the environmental document; or

“(B) an environmental effect considered in the environmental document.

“(b) SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—

“(1) SEPARATE FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—The issuance of a Federal action resulting from a final supplemental environmental impact statement shall be considered a final agency action for the purposes of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, separate from the issuance of any previous environmental impact statement with respect to the same proposed agency action.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR FILING A CLAIM.—A claim seeking judicial review of a Federal action resulting from a final supplemental environmental review issued under section 102(2)(C) shall be barred unless—

“(A) such claim is filed within 120 days of the date on which a notice of the Federal agency action resulting from a final supplemental environmental impact statement is issued; and

“(B) such claim is based on information contained in such supplemental environmental impact statement that was not contained in a previous environmental document pertaining to the same proposed agency action.

“(c) PROHIBITION ON INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a violation of this Act shall not constitute the basis for injunctive relief.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a right of judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim with respect to the violation of the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

“(e) REMAND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no proposed agency action for which an environmental document is required shall be vacated or otherwise limited, delayed, or enjoined unless a court concludes allowing such proposed action will pose a risk of an imminent and substantial environmental harm and there is no other equitable remedy available as a matter of law.

“SEC. 109. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The term ‘categorical exclusion’ means a category of actions that a Federal agency has determined normally does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C).

“(2) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term ‘cooperating agency’ means any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has been designated as a cooperating agency under section 107(a)(3).

“(3) COUNCIL.—The term ‘Council’ means the Council on Environmental Quality established in title II.

“(4) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term ‘environmental assessment’ means an

environmental assessment prepared under section 106(b)(2).

“(5) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ‘environmental document’ means an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a finding of no significant impact.

“(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed written statement that is required by section 102(2)(C).

“(7) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term ‘finding of no significant impact’ means a determination by a Federal agency that a proposed agency action does not require the issuance of an environmental impact statement.

“(8) INVOLVED FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘involved Federal agency’ means an agency that, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) proposed such action; or

“(B) is involved in such action because such action is directly related, through functional interdependence or geographic proximity, to an action such agency has taken or has proposed to take.

“(9) LEAD AGENCY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘lead agency’ means, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(i) the agency that proposed such action; or

“(ii) if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to such action, the agency designated under section 107(a)(1).

“(B) SPECIFICATION FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMITS.—With respect to a proposed mineral exploration or mine permit, the term ‘lead agency’ has the meaning given such term in section 40206(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(10) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘major Federal action’ means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘major Federal action’ does not include—

“(i) a non-Federal action—

“(I) with no or minimal Federal funding;

“(II) with no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project; or

“(III) that does not include Federal land;

“(ii) funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

“(iii) loans, loan guarantees, or other forms of financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise sufficient control and responsibility over the effect of the action;

“(iv) farm ownership and operating loan guarantees by the Farm Service Agency pursuant to sections 305 and 311 through 319 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1925 and 1941 through 1949);

“(v) business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(vi) bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions; or

“(vii) extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(C) ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIONS.—An agency action may not be determined to be a major Federal action on the basis of—

“(i) an interstate effect of the action or related project; or

“(ii) the provision of Federal funds for the action or related project.

“(11) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term ‘mineral exploration or mine permit’ has the meaning given such term in section 40206(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(12) PROPOSAL.—The term ‘proposal’ means a proposed action at a stage when an agency has a goal, is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal, and can meaningfully evaluate its effects.

“(13) REASONABLY FORESEEABLE.—The term ‘reasonably foreseeable’ means likely to occur—

“(A) not later than 10 years after the lead agency begins preparing the environmental document; and

“(B) in an area directly affected by the proposed agency action such that an individual of ordinary prudence would take such occurrence into account in reaching a decision.

“(14) SPECIAL EXPERTISE.—The term ‘special expertise’ means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.”.

SEC. 20203. CODIFICATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REGULATIONS.

The revisions to the Code of Federal Regulations made pursuant to the final rule of the Council on Environmental Quality titled “Update to the Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act” and published on July 16, 2020 (85 Fed. Reg. 43304), shall have the same force and effect of law as if enacted by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 20204. NON-MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS.

(a) EXEMPTION.—An action by the Secretary concerned with respect to a covered activity shall be not considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(b) COVERED ACTIVITY.—In this section, the term “covered activity” includes—

(1) geotechnical investigations;

(2) off-road travel in an existing right-of-way;

(3) construction of meteorological towers where the total surface disturbance at the location is less than 5 acres;

(4) adding a battery or other energy storage device to an existing or planned energy facility, if that storage resource is located within the physical footprint of the existing or planned energy facility;

(5) drilling temperature gradient wells and other geothermal exploratory wells, including construction or making improvements for such activities, where—

(A) the last cemented casing string is less than 12 inches in diameter; and

(B) the total unreclaimed surface disturbance at any one time within the project area is less than 5 acres;

(6) any repair, maintenance, upgrade, optimization, or minor addition to existing transmission and distribution infrastructure, including—

(A) operation, maintenance, or repair of power equipment and structures within existing substations, switching stations, transmission, and distribution lines;

(B) the addition, modification, retirement, or replacement of breakers, transmission towers, transformers, bushings, or relays;

(C) the voltage uprating, modification, reductoring with conventional or advanced conductors, and clearance resolution of transmission lines;

(D) activities to minimize fire risk, including vegetation management, routine fire

mitigation, inspection, and maintenance activities, and removal of hazard trees and other hazard vegetation within or adjacent to an existing right-of-way;

(E) improvements to or construction of structure pads for such infrastructure; and

(F) access and access route maintenance and repairs associated with any activity described in subparagraph (A) through (E);

(7) approval of and activities conducted in accordance with operating plans or agreements for transmission and distribution facilities or under a special use authorization for an electric transmission and distribution facility right-of-way; and

(8) construction, maintenance, realignment, or repair of an existing permanent or temporary access road—

(A) within an existing right-of-way or within a transmission or utility corridor established by Congress or in a land use plan;

(B) that serves an existing transmission line, distribution line, or energy facility; or

(C) activities conducted in accordance with existing onshore oil and gas leases.

SEC. 20205. NO NET LOSS DETERMINATION FOR EXISTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon a determination by the Secretary concerned that there will be no overall long-term net loss of vegetation, soil, or habitat, as defined by acreage and function, resulting from a proposed action, decision, or activity within an existing right-of-way, within a right-of-way corridor established in a land use plan, or in an otherwise designated right-of-way, that action, decision, or activity shall not be considered a major Federal action under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(b) INCLUSION OF REMEDIATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall consider the effect of any remediation work to be conducted during the lifetime of the action, decision, or activity when determining whether there will be any overall long-term net loss of vegetation, soil, or habitat.

SEC. 20206. DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT ADEQUACY.

The Secretary concerned shall use previously completed environmental assessments and environmental impact statements to satisfy the requirements of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) with respect to any major Federal action, if such Secretary determines that—

(1) the new proposed action is substantially the same as a previously analyzed proposed action or alternative analyzed in a previous environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; and

(2) the effects of the proposed action are substantially the same as the effects analyzed in such existing environmental assessments or environmental impact statements.

SEC. 20207. DETERMINATION REGARDING RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

Not later than 60 days after the Secretary concerned receives an application to grant a right-of-way, the Secretary concerned shall notify the applicant as to whether the application is complete or deficient. If the Secretary concerned determines the application is complete, the Secretary concerned may not consider any other application to grant a right-of-way on the same or any overlapping parcels of land while such application is pending.

SEC. 20208. TERMS OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) FIFTY YEAR TERMS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any right-of-way for pipelines for the transportation or distribution of oil or gas granted, issued, amended, or renewed under Federal law may be limited to

a term of not more than 50 years before such right-of-way is subject to renewal or amendment.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.**—Section 501 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Any right-of-way granted, issued, amended, or renewed under subsection (a)(4) may be limited to a term of not more than 50 years before such right-of-way is subject to renewal or amendment.”.

(b) **MINERAL LEASING ACT.**—Section 28(n) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(n)) is amended by striking “thirty” and inserting “50”.

SEC. 20209. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS AND DEVELOP INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In fiscal years 2023 through 2025, the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) and the Secretary of the Interior, after public notice, may accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal entities for dedicated staff, information resource management, and information technology system development to expedite the evaluation of permits, biological opinions, concurrence letters, environmental surveys and studies, processing of applications, consultations, and other activities for the leasing, development, or expansion of an energy facility under the jurisdiction of the respective Secretaries.

(b) **EFFECT ON PERMITTING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the use of funds accepted under subsection (a) will not impact impartial decision making with respect to permits, either substantively or procedurally.

(c) **STATEMENT FOR FAILURE TO ACCEPT OR EXPEND FUNDS.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of the applicable fiscal year, if the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service) or the Secretary of the Interior does not accept funds contributed under subsection (a) or accepts but does not expend such funds, that Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a statement explaining why such funds were not accepted, were not expended, or both, as the case may be.

SEC. 20210. OFFSHORE GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY LICENSING.

The Secretary of the Interior shall authorize geological and geophysical surveys related to oil and gas activities on the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf, except within areas subject to existing oil and gas leasing moratoria. Such authorizations shall be issued within 30 days of receipt of a completed application and shall, as applicable to survey type, comply with the mitigation and monitoring measures in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), and (g) of section 217.184 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2022), and section 217.185 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2022). Geological and geophysical surveys authorized pursuant to this section are deemed to be in full compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and their implementing regulations.

SEC. 20211. DEFERRAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.

Section 17(p)(3) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **DEFERRAL BASED ON FORMATTING ISSUES.**—A decision on an application for a permit to drill may not be deferred under

paragraph (2)(B) as a result of a formatting issue with the permit, unless such formatting issue results in missing information.”.

SEC. 20212. PROCESSING AND TERMS OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.

(a) **EFFECT OF PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.**—Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **EFFECT OF PENDING CIVIL ACTION ON PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL.**—Pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2), notwithstanding the existence of any pending civil actions affecting the application or related lease, the Secretary shall process an application for a permit to drill or other authorizations or approvals under a valid existing lease, unless a United States Federal court vacated such lease. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as providing authority to a Federal court to vacate a lease.”.

(b) **TERM OF PERMIT TO DRILL.**—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(u) **TERM OF PERMIT TO DRILL.**—A permit to drill issued under this section after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall be valid for one four-year term from the date that the permit is approved, or until the lease regarding which the permit is issued expires, whichever occurs first.”.

SEC. 20213. AMENDMENTS TO THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.

Section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15942) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 390. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REVIEW.

“(a) **NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT REVIEW.**—Action by the Secretary of the Interior, in managing the public lands, or the Secretary of Agriculture, in managing National Forest System lands, with respect to any of the activities described in subsection (c), shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, if the activity is conducted pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) for the purpose of exploration or development of oil or gas.

“(b) **APPLICATION.**—This section shall not apply to an action of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

“(c) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—The activities referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

“(1) Reinstating a lease pursuant to section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188).

“(2) The following activities, provided that any new surface disturbance is contiguous with the footprint of the original authorization and does not exceed 20 acres or the acreage has previously been evaluated in a document previously prepared under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) with respect to such activity:

“(A) Drilling an oil or gas well at a well pad site at which drilling has occurred previously.

“(B) Expansion of an existing oil or gas well pad site to accommodate an additional well.

“(C) Expansion or modification of an existing oil or gas well pad site, road, pipeline, facility, or utility submitted in a sundry notice.

“(3) Drilling of an oil or gas well at a new well pad site, provided that the new surface disturbance does not exceed 20 acres and the acreage evaluated in a document previously

prepared under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) with respect to such activity, whichever is greater.

“(4) Construction or realignment of a road, pipeline, or utility within an existing right-of-way or within a right-of-way corridor established in a land use plan.

“(5) The following activities when conducted from non-Federal surface into federally owned minerals, provided that the operator submits to the Secretary concerned certification of a surface use agreement with the non-Federal landowner:

“(A) Drilling an oil or gas well at a well pad site at which drilling has occurred previously.

“(B) Expansion of an existing oil or gas well pad site to accommodate an additional well.

“(C) Expansion or modification of an existing oil or gas well pad site, road, pipeline, facility, or utility submitted in a sundry notice.

“(6) Drilling of an oil or gas well from non-Federal surface and non-Federal subsurface into Federal mineral estate.

“(7) Construction of up to 1 mile of new road on Federal or non-Federal surface, not to exceed 2 miles in total.

“(8) Construction of up to 3 miles of individual pipelines or utilities, regardless of surface ownership.”.

SEC. 20214. ACCESS TO FEDERAL ENERGY RESOURCES FROM NON-FEDERAL SURFACE ESTATE.

(a) **OIL AND GAS PERMITS.**—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) **NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for oil and gas exploration and production activities conducted on non-Federal surface estate, provided that—

“(A) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface mineral estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and

“(B) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct oil and gas exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.

“(2) **NO FEDERAL ACTION.**—An oil and gas exploration and production activity carried out under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

“(B) shall require no additional Federal action;

“(C) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary; and

“(D) shall not be subject to—

“(i) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966); and

“(ii) section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

“(3) **ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.**—(A) Nothing in this subsection shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of oil and gas, or alter the Secretary's authority to conduct audits and collect civil penalties pursuant to the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

“(B) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of production of Federal oil and gas, and payment of royalties.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

“(5) INDIAN LAND.—In this subsection, the term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(A) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia; and

“(B) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia, the title to which is held—

“(i) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;

“(ii) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

“(iii) by a dependent Indian community.”.

(b) GEOTHERMAL PERMITS.—The Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 30. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for geothermal exploration and production activities conducted on a non-Federal surface estate, provided that—

“(1) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface geothermal estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and

“(2) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct geothermal exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.

“(b) NO FEDERAL ACTION.—A geothermal exploration and production activity carried out under paragraph (1)—

“(1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

“(2) shall require no additional Federal action;

“(3) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary; and

“(4) shall not be subject to—

“(A) section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966); and

“(B) section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

“(c) ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of electricity using geothermal resources (other than direct use of geothermal resources) or the production of any byproducts.

“(2) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of the production described in paragraph (1), and payment of royalties.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

“(e) INDIAN LAND.—In this section, the term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(1) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia; and

“(2) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia, the title to which is held—

“(A) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;

“(B) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

“(C) by a dependent Indian community.”.

SEC. 20215. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR OIL AND GAS LEASES.

An environmental review for an oil and gas lease or permit prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and its implementing regulations—

(1) shall apply only to areas that are within or immediately adjacent to the lease plot or plots and that are directly affected by the proposed action; and

(2) shall not require consideration of downstream, indirect effects of oil and gas consumption.

SEC. 20216. EXPEDITING APPROVAL OF GATHERING LINES.

Section 11318(b)(1) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 15943(b)(1)) is amended by striking “to be an action that is categorically excluded (as defined in section 1508.1 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act))” and inserting “to not be a major Federal action”.

SEC. 20217. LEASE SALE LITIGATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any oil and gas lease sale held under section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (26 U.S.C. 226) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) shall not be vacated and activities on leases awarded in the sale shall not be otherwise limited, delayed, or enjoined unless the court concludes allowing development of the challenged lease will pose a risk of an imminent and substantial environmental harm and there is no other equitable remedy available as a matter of law. No court, in response to an action brought pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq.), may enjoin or issue any order preventing the award of leases to a bidder in a lease sale conducted pursuant to section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (26 U.S.C. 226) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) if the Department of the Interior has previously opened bids for such leases or disclosed the high bidder for any tract that was included in such lease sale.

SEC. 20218. LIMITATION ON CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for a mineral project, energy facility, or energy storage device shall be barred unless—

(1) the claim is filed within 120 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law pursuant to which judicial review is allowed; and

(2) the claim is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the public comment period for such permit, license, or approval and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review.

(b) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

(c) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to or supersede a claim subject to section 139(1)(1) of title 23, United States Code.

(d) MINERAL PROJECT.—In this section, the term “mineral project” means a project—

(1) located on—

(A) a mining claim, millsite claim, or tunnel site claim for any mineral;

(B) lands open to mineral entry; or

(C) a Federal mineral lease; and

(2) for the purposes of exploring for or producing minerals.

SEC. 20219. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT ON PERMITS TO DRILL.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report detailing—

(1) the approval timelines for applications for permits to drill issued by the Bureau of Land Management from 2018 through 2022;

(2) the number of applications for permits to drill that were not issued within 30 days of receipt of a completed application; and

(3) the causes of delays resulting in applications for permits to drill pending beyond the 30 day deadline required under section 17(p)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)(2)).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report issued under subsection (a) shall include recommendations with respect to—

(1) actions the Bureau of Land Management can take to streamline the approval process for applications for permits to drill to approve applications for permits to drill within 30 days of receipt of a completed application;

(2) aspects of the Federal permitting process carried out by the Bureau of Land Management to issue applications for permits to drill that can be turned over to States to expedite approval of applications for permits to drill; and

(3) legislative actions that Congress must take to allow States to administer certain aspects of the Federal permitting process described in paragraph (2).

SEC. 20220. E-NEPA.

(a) PERMITTING PORTAL STUDY.—The Council on Environmental Quality shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this Act on the potential to create an online permitting portal for permits that require review under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) that would—

(1) allow applicants to—

(A) submit required documents or materials for their application in one unified portal;

(B) upload additional documents as required by the applicable agency; and

(C) track the progress of individual applications;

(2) enhance interagency coordination in consultation by—

(A) allowing for comments in one unified portal;

(B) centralizing data necessary for reviews; and

(C) streamlining communications between other agencies and the applicant; and

(3) boost transparency in agency decision-making.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the Council of Environmental Quality to carry out the study directed by this section.

TITLE III—PERMITTING FOR MINING NEEDS

SEC. 20301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BYPRODUCT.—The term “byproduct” has the meaning given such term in section 7002(a) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)).

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(3) MINERAL.—The term “mineral” means any mineral of a kind that is locatable (including, but not limited to, such minerals located on “lands acquired by the United States”, as such term is defined in section 2 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands) under the Act of May 10, 1872 (Chapter 152; 17 Stat. 91).

(4) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means—

- (A) a State;
- (B) the District of Columbia;
- (C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;
- (D) Guam;
- (E) American Samoa;
- (F) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and
- (G) the United States Virgin Islands.

SEC. 20302. MINERALS SUPPLY CHAIN AND RELIABILITY.

Section 40206 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (30 U.S.C. 1607) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “CRITICAL MINERALS” and inserting “MINERALS”;

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ‘lead agency’ means the Federal agency with primary responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit or lease for a mineral project.

“(2) MINERAL.—The term ‘mineral’ has the meaning given such term in section 20301 of the TAPP American Resources Act.

“(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term ‘mineral exploration or mine permit’ means—

“(A) an authorization of the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service, as applicable, for exploration for minerals that requires analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

“(B) a plan of operations for a mineral project approved by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service; or

“(C) any other Federal permit or authorization for a mineral project.

“(4) MINERAL PROJECT.—The term ‘mineral project’ means a project—

- “(A) located on—
- “(i) a mining claim, millsite claim, or tunnel site claim for any mineral;
- “(ii) lands open to mineral entry; or
- “(iii) a Federal mineral lease; and
- “(B) for the purposes of exploring for or producing minerals.”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “critical” each place such term appears;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “critical mineral production on Federal land” and inserting “mineral projects”;

(B) by inserting “, and in accordance with subsection (h)” after “to the maximum extent practicable”;

(C) by striking “shall complete the” and inserting “shall complete such”;

(D) in paragraph (1), by striking “critical mineral-related activities on Federal land” and inserting “mineral projects”;

(E) in paragraph (8), by striking the “and” at the end;

(F) in paragraph (9), by striking “procedures.” and inserting “procedures; and”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) deferring to and relying on baseline data, analyses, and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the environmental or reclamation permits for the proposed mineral project.”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “critical” each place such term appears; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “mineral-related activities on Federal land” and inserting “mineral projects”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “critical”;

(7) in subsection (f), by striking “critical” each place such term appears;

(8) in subsection (g), by striking “critical” each place such term appears; and

(9) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—For purposes of maximizing efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal permitting and review processes described under subsection (c), the lead agency in the Federal permitting and review processes of a mineral project shall (in consultation with any other Federal agency involved in such Federal permitting and review processes, and upon request of the project applicant, an affected State government, local government, or an Indian Tribe, or other entity such lead agency determines appropriate) enter into a memorandum of agreement with a project applicant where requested by the applicant to carry out the activities described in subsection (c).

“(2) TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES FOR NEPA REVIEWS.—

“(A) EXTENSION.—A project applicant may enter into 1 or more agreements with a lead agency to extend the deadlines described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (h)(1) of section 107 of title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 by, with respect to each such agreement, not more than 6 months.

“(B) ADJUSTMENT OF TIMELINES.—At the request of a project applicant, the lead agency and any other entity which is a signatory to a memorandum of agreement under paragraph (1) may, by unanimous agreement, adjust—

“(i) any deadlines described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) any deadlines extended under subparagraph (B).

“(3) EFFECT ON PENDING APPLICATIONS.—Upon a written request by a project applicant, the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any application for a mineral exploration or mine permit or mineral lease that was submitted before the date of the enactment of the TAPP American Resources Act.”.

SEC. 20303. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS IMPROVEMENT.

Section 7002(f) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “critical” both places such term appears; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 20304. DESIGNATION OF MINING AS A COVERED SECTOR FOR FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES.

Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended by inserting “mineral production,” before “or any other sector”.

SEC. 20305. TREATMENT OF ACTIONS UNDER PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION 2022-11 FOR FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (c), an action described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) treated as a covered project, as defined in section 41001(6) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)), without regard to the requirements of that section; and

(2) included in the Permitting Dashboard maintained pursuant to section 41003(b) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m-2(b)).

(b) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—An action described in this subsection is an action taken by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to Presidential Determination 2022-11 (87 Fed. Reg. 19775; relating to certain actions under

section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950) or the Presidential Memorandum of February 27, 2023, titled “Presidential Waiver of Statutory Requirements Pursuant to Section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, on Department of Defense Supply Chains Resilience” (88 Fed. Reg. 13015) to create, maintain, protect, expand, or restore sustainable and responsible domestic production capabilities through—

(1) supporting feasibility studies for mature mining, beneficiation, and value-added processing projects;

(2) byproduct and co-product production at existing mining, mine waste reclamation, and other industrial facilities;

(3) modernization of mining, beneficiation, and value-added processing to increase productivity, environmental sustainability, and workforce safety; or

(4) any other activity authorized under section 303(a)(1) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4533(a)(1)).

(c) EXCEPTION.—An action described in subsection (b) may not be treated as a covered project or be included in the Permitting Dashboard under subsection (a) if the project sponsor (as defined in section 41001(18) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 21 4370m(18))) requests that the action not be treated as a covered project.

SEC. 20306. NOTICE FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION ACTIVITIES WITH LIMITED SURFACE DISTURBANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days before commencing an exploration activity with a surface disturbance of not more than 5 acres of public lands, the operator of such exploration activity shall submit to the Secretary concerned a complete notice of such exploration activity.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—Notice submitted under subsection (a) shall include such information the Secretary concerned may require, including the information described in section 3809.301 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(c) REVIEW.—Not later than 15 days after the Secretary concerned receives notice submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall—

(1) review and determine completeness of the notice; and

(2) allow exploration activities to proceed if—

(A) the surface disturbance of such exploration activities on such public lands will not exceed 5 acres;

(B) the Secretary concerned determines that the notice is complete; and

(C) the operator provides financial assurance that the Secretary concerned determines is adequate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXPLORATION ACTIVITY.—The term “exploration activity”—

(A) means creating surface disturbance greater than casual use that includes sampling, drilling, or developing surface or underground workings to evaluate the type, extent, quantity, or quality of mineral values present;

(B) includes constructing drill roads and drill pads, drilling, trenching, excavating test pits, and conducting geotechnical tests and geophysical surveys; and

(C) does not include activities where material is extracted for commercial use or sale.

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior; and

(B) with respect to National Forest System lands, the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 20307. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A claimant shall have the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

“(i) such claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102 and the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

“(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver under subsection (d), such claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee and complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

“(B) OPERATIONS DEFINED.—For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘operations’ means—

“(i) any activity or work carried out in connection with prospecting, exploration, processing, discovery and assessment, development, or extraction with respect to a locatable mineral;

“(ii) the reclamation of any disturbed areas; and

“(iii) any other reasonably incident uses, whether on a mining claim or not, including the construction and maintenance of facilities, roads, transmission lines, pipelines, and any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for support facilities.

“(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of any provision of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act that requires the payment of fair market value to the United States for use of public lands and resources relating to use of such lands and resources authorized by the general mining laws.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to diminish the rights of entry, use, and occupancy, or any other right, of a claimant under the general mining laws.”.

SEC. 20308. ENSURING CONSIDERATION OF URANIUM AS A CRITICAL MINERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7002(a)(3)(B)(i) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows: “(i) oil, oil shale, coal, or natural gas;”.

(b) UPDATE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall publish in the Federal Register an update to the final list established in section 7002(c)(3) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(c)(3)) in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 20309. BARRING FOREIGN BAD ACTORS FROM OPERATING ON FEDERAL LANDS.

A mining claimant shall be barred from the right to use, occupy, and conduct operations on Federal land if the Secretary of the Interior finds the claimant has a foreign parent company that has (including through a subsidiary)—

(1) a known record of human rights violations; or

(2) knowingly operated an illegal mine in another country.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING**SEC. 20401. FEDERAL LAND USE PLANNING AND WITHDRAWALS.**

(a) RESOURCE ASSESSMENTS REQUIRED.—Federal lands and waters may not be with-

drawn from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws unless—

(1) a quantitative and qualitative geophysical and geological mineral resource assessment of the impacted area has been completed during the 10-year period ending on the date of such withdrawal;

(2) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of the economic, energy, strategic, and national security value of mineral deposits identified in such mineral resource assessment;

(3) the Secretary conducts an assessment of the reduction in future Federal revenues to the Treasury, States, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Historic Preservation Fund, and the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund resulting from the proposed mineral withdrawal;

(4) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of military readiness and training activities in the proposed withdrawal area; and

(5) the Secretary submits a report to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs of the Senate, that includes the results of the assessments completed pursuant to this subsection.

(b) LAND USE PLANS.—Before a resource management plan under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or a forest management plan under the National Forest Management Act is updated or completed, the Secretary or Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, in consultation with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall—

(1) review any quantitative and qualitative mineral resource assessment that was completed or updated during the 10-year period ending on the date that the applicable land management agency publishes a notice to prepare, revise, or amend a land use plan by the Director of the United States Geological Survey for the geographic area affected by the applicable management plan;

(2) the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, conducts an assessment of the economic, energy, strategic, and national security value of mineral deposits identified in such mineral resource assessment; and

(3) submit a report to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs of the Senate, that includes the results of the assessment completed pursuant to this subsection.

(c) NEW INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall provide recommendations to the President on appropriate measures to reduce unnecessary impacts that a withdrawal of Federal lands or waters from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws may have on mineral exploration, development, and other mineral activities (including authorizing exploration and development of such mineral deposits) not later than 180 days after the Secretary has notice that a resource assessment completed by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in coordination with the State geological surveys, determines that a previously undiscovered mineral deposit may be present in an area that has been withdrawn from entry under the mining laws or operation of the mineral leasing and mineral materials laws pursuant to—

(1) section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714); or

(2) chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 20402. PROHIBITIONS ON DELAY OF MINERAL DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall not carry out any action that would pause, restrict, or delay the process for or issuance of any of the following on Federal land, unless such lands are withdrawn from disposition under the mineral leasing laws, including by administrative withdrawal:

(1) New oil and gas lease sales, oil and gas leases, drill permits, or associated approvals or authorizations of any kind associated with oil and gas leases.

(2) New coal leases (including leases by application in process, renewals, modifications, or expansions of existing leases), permits, approvals, or authorizations.

(3) New leases, claims, permits, approvals, or authorizations for development or exploration of minerals.

(b) PROHIBITION ON RESCISSION OF LEASES, PERMITS, OR CLAIMS.—The President, the Secretary, or Secretary of Agriculture as applicable, may not rescind any existing lease, permit, or claim for the extraction and production of any mineral under the mining laws or mineral leasing and mineral materials laws on National Forest System land or land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, unless specifically authorized by Federal statute, or upon the lessee, permittee, or claimant's failure to comply with any of the provisions of the applicable lease, permit, or claim.

(c) MINERAL DEFINED.—In subsection (a)(3), the term “mineral” means any mineral of a kind that is locatable (including such minerals located on ‘lands acquired by the United States’, as such term is defined in section 2 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands) under the Act of May 10, 1872 (Chapter 152; 17 Stat. 91).

SEC. 20403. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means—

(A) National Forest System land;

(B) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702));

(C) the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)); and

(D) land managed by the Secretary of Energy.

(2) PRESIDENT.—The term “President” means—

(A) the President; and

(B) any designee of the President, including—

(i) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(ii) the Secretary of Commerce;

(iii) the Secretary of Energy; and

(iv) the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) PREVIOUSLY UNDISCOVERED DEPOSIT.—The term “previously undiscovered mineral deposit” means—

(A) a mineral deposit that has been previously evaluated by the United States Geological Survey and found to be of low mineral potential, but upon subsequent evaluation is determined by the United States Geological Survey to have significant mineral potential; or

(B) a mineral deposit that has not previously been evaluated by the United States Geological Survey.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

TITLE V—ENSURING COMPETITIVENESS ON FEDERAL LANDS

SEC. 20501. INCENTIVIZING DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.

(a) OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS ROYALTY RATE.—Section 8(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “not less than 16½ percent, but not more than 18¼ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’, and not less than 16½ percent thereafter,” each place it appears and inserting “not less than 12.5 percent”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “not less than 16½ percent, but not more than 18¼ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’, and not less than 16½ percent thereafter,” each place it appears and inserting “not less than 12.5 percent”;

(3) in subparagraph (F), by striking “not less than 16½ percent, but not more than 18¼ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’, and not less than 16½ percent thereafter,” and inserting “not less than 12.5 percent”;

(4) in subparagraph (H), by striking “not less than 16½ percent, but not more than 18¼ percent, during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’, and not less than 16½ percent thereafter,” and inserting “not less than 12.5 percent”.

(b) MINERAL LEASING ACT.—

(1) ONSHORE OIL AND GAS ROYALTY RATES.—

(A) LEASE OF OIL AND GAS LAND.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(1)(A)—

(I) by striking “not less than 16½” and inserting “not less than 12.5”; and

(II) by striking “or, in the case of a lease issued during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’, 16½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease”; and

(ii) by striking “16½ percent” each place it appears and inserting “12.5 percent”.

(B) CONDITIONS FOR REINSTATEMENT.—Section 31(e)(3) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188(e)(3)) is amended by striking “20” inserting “16½”.

(2) OIL AND GAS MINIMUM BID.—Section 17(b) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “\$10 per acre during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act titled ‘An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 14’,” and inserting “\$2 per acre for a period of 2 years from the date of the enactment of the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “\$10 per acre” and inserting “\$2 per acre”.

(3) FOSSIL FUEL RENTAL RATES.—Section 17(d) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) All leases issued under this section, as amended by the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987, shall be conditioned upon payment by the lessee of a rental of not less than \$1.50 per acre per year for the first through fifth years of the lease and not less than \$2 per acre per year for each year thereafter. A minimum royalty in lieu

of rental of not less than the rental which otherwise would be required for that lease year shall be payable at the expiration of each lease year beginning on or after a discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities on the lands leased.”.

(4) EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FEE.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended by repealing subsection (q).

(5) ELIMINATION OF NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING.—Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226) is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(II) by adding at the end “Lands for which no bids are received or for which the highest bid is less than the national minimum acceptable bid shall be offered promptly within 30 days for leasing under subsection (c) of this section and shall remain available for leasing for a period of 2 years after the competitive lease sale.”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3)(A) If the United States held a vested future interest in a mineral estate that, immediately prior to becoming a vested present interest, was subject to a lease under which oil or gas was being produced, or had a well capable of producing, in paying quantities at an annual average production volume per well per day of either not more than 15 barrels per day of oil or condensate, or not more than 60,000 cubic feet of gas, the holder of the lease may elect to continue the lease as a noncompetitive lease under subsection (c)(1).

“(B) An election under this paragraph is effective—

“(i) in the case of an interest which vested after January 1, 1990, and on or before October 24, 1992, if the election is made before the date that is 1 year after October 24, 1992;

“(ii) in the case of an interest which vests within 1 year after October 24, 1992, if the election is made before the date that is 2 years after October 24, 1992; and

“(iii) in any case other than those described in clause (i) or (ii), if the election is made prior to the interest becoming a vested present interest.”;

(B) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) LANDS SUBJECT TO LEASING UNDER SUBSECTION (B); FIRST QUALIFIED APPLICANT.—

“(1) If the lands to be leased are not leased under subsection (b)(1) of this section or are not subject to competitive leasing under subsection (b)(2) of this section, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this chapter shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding, upon payment of a non-refundable application fee of at least \$75. A lease under this subsection shall be conditioned upon the payment of a royalty at a rate of 12.5 percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Leases shall be issued within 60 days of the date on which the Secretary identifies the first responsible qualified applicant.

“(2)(A) Lands (i) which were posted for sale under subsection (b)(1) of this section but for which no bids were received or for which the highest bid was less than the national minimum acceptable bid and (ii) for which, at the end of the period referred to in subsection (b)(1) of this section no lease has been issued and no lease application is pending under paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall again be available for leasing only in accordance with subsection (b)(1) of this section.

“(B) The land in any lease which is issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection or under subsection (b)(1) of this section which lease terminates, expires, is cancelled or is relinquished shall again be available for leasing only in accordance with subsection (b)(1) of this section.”; and

(C) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) PRIMARY TERM.—Competitive and noncompetitive leases issued under this section shall be for a primary term of 10 years: Provided, however, That competitive leases issued in special tar sand areas shall also be for a primary term of 10 years. Each such lease shall continue so long after its primary term as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Any lease issued under this section for land on which, or for which under an approved cooperative or unit plan of development or operation, actual drilling operations were commenced prior to the end of its primary term and are being diligently prosecuted at that time shall be extended for two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.”.

(6) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 188) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “section 17(b)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (c) of section 17 of this Act”;

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) insert “either” after “rentals and”; and

(II) insert “or the inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(c) of this Act of a requirement that future rentals shall be at a rate not less than \$5 per acre per year, all” before “as determined by the Secretary”; and

(ii) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3)(A) payment of back royalties and the inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(b) of this Act of a requirement for future royalties at a rate of not less than 16½ percent computed on a sliding scale based upon the average production per well per day, at a rate which shall be not less than 4 percentage points greater than the competitive royalty schedule then in force and used for royalty determination for competitive leases issued pursuant to such section as determined by the Secretary: Provided, That royalty on such reinstated lease shall be paid on all production removed or sold from such lease subsequent to the termination of the original lease;

“(B) payment of back royalties and inclusion in a reinstated lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 17(c) of this Act of a requirement for future royalties at a rate not less than 16½ percent: Provided, That royalty on such reinstated lease shall be paid on all production removed or sold from such lease subsequent to the cancellation or termination of the original lease; and”;

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1), strike “in the same manner as the original lease issued pursuant to section 17” and insert “as a competitive or a noncompetitive oil and gas lease in the same manner as the original lease issued pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 17 of this Act”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraph (3) and (4), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the issuance of a lease in lieu of an abandoned patented oil placer mining claim shall be treated as a noncompetitive oil and gas lease issued pursuant to section 17(c) of this Act.”;

(D) in subsection (g), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsections (d) and (f)”;

(E) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

“(h) ROYALTY REDUCTIONS.—

“(1) In acting on a petition to issue a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, under subsection (f) of this section or in response to a request filed after issuance of such a lease, or both, the Secretary is authorized to reduce the royalty on such lease if in his judgment it is equitable to do so or the circumstances warrant such relief due to uneconomic or other circumstances which could cause undue hardship or premature termination of production.

“(2) In acting on a petition for reinstatement pursuant to subsection (d) of this section or in response to a request filed after reinstatement, or both, the Secretary is authorized to reduce the royalty in that reinstated lease on the entire leasehold or any tract or portion thereof segregated for royalty purposes if, in his judgment, there are uneconomic or other circumstances which could cause undue hardship or premature termination of production; or because of any written action of the United States, its agents or employees, which preceded, and was a major consideration in, the lessee's expenditure of funds to develop the property under the lease after the rent had become due and had not been paid; or if in the judgment of the Secretary it is equitable to do so for any reason.”;

(F) by redesignating subsections (f) through (i) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively; and

(G) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) ISSUANCE OF NONCOMPETITIVE OIL AND GAS LEASE; CONDITIONS.—Where an unpatented oil placer mining claim validly located prior to February 24, 1920, which has been or is currently producing or is capable of producing oil or gas, has been or is hereafter deemed conclusively abandoned for failure to file timely the required instruments or copies of instruments required by section 1744 of title 43, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such failure was inadvertent, justifiable, or not due to lack of reasonable diligence on the part of the owner, the Secretary may issue, for the lands covered by the abandoned unpatented oil placer mining claim, a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, consistent with the provisions of section 17(e) of this Act, to be effective from the statutory date the claim was deemed conclusively abandoned. Issuance of such a lease shall be conditioned upon:

“(1) a petition for issuance of a noncompetitive oil and gas lease, together with the required rental and royalty, including back rental and royalty accruing from the statutory date of abandonment of the oil placer mining claim, being filed with the Secretary— (A) with respect to any claim deemed conclusively abandoned on or before January 12, 1983, on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after January 12, 1983, or (B) with respect to any claim deemed conclusively abandoned after January 12, 1983, on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after final notification by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction of the determination of the abandonment of the oil placer mining claim;

“(2) a valid lease not having been issued affecting any of the lands covered by the abandoned oil placer mining claim prior to the filing of such petition: Provided, however, That after the filing of a petition for issuance of a lease under this subsection, the Secretary shall not issue any new lease affecting any of the lands covered by such abandoned oil placer mining claim for a rea-

sonable period, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by him;

“(3) a requirement in the lease for payment of rental, including back rentals accruing from the statutory date of abandonment of the oil placer mining claim, of not less than \$5 per acre per year;

“(4) a requirement in the lease for payment of royalty on production removed or sold from the oil placer mining claim, including all royalty on production made subsequent to the statutory date the claim was deemed conclusively abandoned, of not less than 12½ percent; and

“(5) compliance with the notice and reimbursement of costs provisions of paragraph (4) of subsection (e) but addressed to the petition covering the conversion of an abandoned unpatented oil placer mining claim to a noncompetitive oil and gas lease.”.

TITLE VI—ENERGY REVENUE SHARING

SEC. 20601. GULF OF MEXICO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUE.

(a) DISTRIBUTION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUE TO GULF PRODUCING STATES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “50” and inserting “37.5”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “50” and inserting “62.5”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “75” and inserting “80”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “25” and inserting “20”; and

(2) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts disbursed to a Gulf producing State under this section shall be treated as revenue sharing and not as a Federal award or grant for the purposes of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations.”.

(b) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28-0404-0-1-651).” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to section 105(a)(2)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note) (014-5535-0-2-302).”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20602. PARITY IN OFFSHORE WIND REVENUE SHARING.

(a) PAYMENTS AND REVENUES.—Section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(B) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(B) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN 3 NAUTICAL MILES SEAWARD OF STATE SUBMERGED LAND.—The Secretary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES FOR OFFSHORE WIND PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) COVERED OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT.—The term ‘covered offshore wind project’ means a wind powered electric generation project in a wind energy area on the outer Continental Shelf that is not wholly or partially located within an area subject to subparagraph (B).

“(II) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term ‘eligible State’ means a State a point on the coastline of which is located within 75 miles of the geographic center of a covered offshore wind project.

“(III) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—The term ‘qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues’ means all royalties, fees, rentals, bonuses, or other payments from covered offshore wind projects carried out pursuant to this subsection on or after the date of enactment of this subparagraph.

“(ii) REQUIREMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

“(aa) 12.5 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in the general fund of the Treasury;

“(bb) 37.5 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund; and

“(cc) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse to each eligible State an amount determined pursuant to subclause (II).

“(II) ALLOCATION.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Subject to item (bb), for each fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the amount made available under subclause (I)(cc) shall be allocated to each eligible State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each eligible State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

“(bb) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to an eligible State each fiscal year under item (aa) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts made available under subclause (I)(cc).

“(cc) PAYMENTS TO COASTAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

“(AA) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pay 20 percent of the allocable share of each eligible State, as determined pursuant to item (aa), to the coastal political subdivisions of the eligible State.

“(BB) ALLOCATION.—The amount paid by the Secretary to coastal political subdivisions under subitem (AA) shall be allocated to each coastal political subdivision in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 31(b)(4) of this Act.

“(iii) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under subclause (I) of clause (ii) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with such subclause during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

“(iv) AUTHORIZED USES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), each eligible State shall use all amounts received under clause (ii)(II) in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws, only for 1 or more of the following purposes: “(aa) Projects and activities for the purposes of coastal protection and resiliency, including conservation, coastal restoration, estuary management, beach nourishment, hurricane and flood protection, and infrastructure directly affected by coastal wetland losses.

“(bb) Mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, or natural resources, including through fisheries science and research.

“(cc) Implementation of a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation management plan.

“(dd) Mitigation of the impact of outer Continental Shelf activities through the funding of onshore infrastructure projects.

“(ee) Planning assistance and the administrative costs of complying with this section.

“(ff) Infrastructure improvements at ports, including modifications to Federal navigation channels, to support installation of offshore wind energy projects.

“(II) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts received by an eligible State under clause (ii)(II), not more than 3 percent shall be used for the purposes described in subclause (I)(ee).

“(v) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to clause (vi)(III), amounts made available under items (aa) and (cc) of clause (ii)(I) shall—

“(I) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this subparagraph;

“(II) remain available until expended; and

“(III) be in addition to any amount appropriated under any other Act.

“(vi) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Governor of each eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(II) for the applicable fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the use of the amounts by the eligible State during the period covered by the report.

“(II) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—On receipt of a report submitted under subclause (I), the Secretary shall make the report available to the public on the website of the Department of the Interior.

“(III) LIMITATION.—If the Governor of an eligible State that receives amounts under clause (ii)(II) fails to submit the report required under subclause (I) by the deadline specified in that subclause, any amounts that would otherwise be provided to the eligible State under clause (ii)(II) for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury.

“(vi) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts disbursed to an eligible State under this subsection shall be treated as revenue sharing and not as a Federal award or grant for the purposes of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations.”.

(b) WIND LEASE SALES FOR AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE OF TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 33 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) WIND LEASE SALE PROCEDURE.—Any wind lease granted pursuant to this section shall be considered a wind lease granted under section 8(p), including for purposes of the disposition of revenues pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 8(p)(2).”.

(c) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28-0404-0-1-651).” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to subparagraph (C)(ii)(I)(cc) of section 8(p)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)).”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20603. ELIMINATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE FEE UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking “and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b),”;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively;

(4) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of subsection (b) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(5) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii) of subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (c)(2)(B)” and inserting “subsection (b)(2)(B)”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 355(a)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Subject to the provisions of section 35(b) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(b)), all” and inserting “All”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “of the Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 450; 30 U.S.C. 191),” and inserting “of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191)”.

(2) Section 20(a) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019(a)) is amended, in the second sentence of the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the provisions of subsection (b) of section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(b)) and section 5(a)(2) of this Act” and inserting “section 5(a)(2)”.

(3) Section 205(f) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1735(f)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “this Section” and inserting “this section”; and

(B) by striking the fourth, fifth, and sixth sentences.

2SEC. 20604. SUNSET.

This title, and the amendments made by this title, shall cease to have effect on September 30, 2032, and on such date the provisions of law amended by this title shall be restored or revived as if this title had not been enacted.

DIVISION C—WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION AND ENERGY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 30001. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act of 2023”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this division is as follows:

DIVISION C—WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION AND ENERGY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 30001. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 30002. Certification.

SEC. 30002. CERTIFICATION.

Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “may result” and inserting “may directly result”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “activity” and inserting “discharge”;

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking “applications” each place it appears and inserting “requests”;

(iv) in the fifth sentence, by striking “act on” and inserting “grant or deny”;

(v) by inserting after the fourth sentence the following: “Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Certification and Energy Project Improvement Act of 2023, each State and interstate agency that has authority to give such a certification, and the Administrator, shall publish requirements for certification to demonstrate to such State, such interstate agency, or the Administrator, as the case may be, compliance with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307. A decision to grant or deny a request for certification shall be based only on the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, and the grounds for the decision shall be set

forth in writing and provided to the applicant. Not later than 90 days after receipt of a request for certification, the State, interstate agency, or Administrator, as the case may be, shall identify in writing all specific additional materials or information that are necessary to grant or deny the request.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “notice of application for such Federal license or permit” and inserting “receipt of a notice under the preceding sentence”;

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “any water quality requirement” and inserting “any applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307”;

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by striking “insure compliance with applicable water quality requirements.” and inserting “ensure compliance with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307.”;

(iv) in the final sentence, by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(v) by striking the first sentence and inserting “On receipt of a request for certification, the certifying State or interstate agency, as applicable, shall immediately notify the Administrator of the request.”;

(C) in paragraph (3), in the second sentence, by striking “section” and inserting “any applicable provision of section”;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “applicable effluent limitations or other limitations or other applicable water quality requirements will not be violated” and inserting “no applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307 will be violated”;

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “will violate applicable effluent limitations or other limitations or other water quality requirements” and inserting “will directly result in a discharge that violates an applicable provision of section 301, 302, 303, 306, or 307.”;

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking “such facility or activity will not violate the applicable provisions” and inserting “operation of such facility or activity will not directly result in a discharge that violates any applicable provision”;

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking “the applicable provisions” and inserting “any applicable provision”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “any applicable effluent limitations and other limitations, under section 301 or 302 of this Act, standard of performance under section 306 of this Act, or prohibition, effluent standard, or pretreatment standard under section 307 of this Act, and with any other appropriate requirement of State law set forth in such certification, and” and inserting “the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307, and any such limitations or requirements”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) For purposes of this section, the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 are any applicable effluent limitations and other limitations, under section 301 or 302, standard of performance under section 306, prohibition, effluent standard, or pretreatment standard under section 307, and requirement of State law implementing water quality criteria under section 303 necessary to support the designated use or uses of the receiving navigable waters.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 118-30. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable

for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall conduct a study on how to streamline regulatory timelines relating to developing new power plants by examining practices relating to various power generating sources, including fossil and nuclear generating sources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the time and the effort here.

In an effort to ultimately streamline the regulatory approval timeline, my amendment requires the implementation of a study that explores the licensing and permitting process of other energy sources under the Department of Energy's jurisdiction.

By studying the licensing procedures of various energy sources, we can streamline the regulatory process overall by cutting down unnecessary red tape.

My amendment seeks to optimize American power production, create a sense of ease and standardization in the regulatory maze surrounding various energy sources and examine other regulatory procedures to safely expedite the approval timeline.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. 10007. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE DENIAL OF JORDAN COVE PERMITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 19, 2020, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission granted two Federal

permits to Jordan Cove Energy Project, L.P., to site, construct, and operate a new liquefied natural gas export terminal in Coos County, Oregon.

(2) On the same day, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline, L.P., to construct and operate the proposed Pacific Connector Pipeline in the counties of Klamath, Jackson, Douglas, and Coos of Oregon.

(3) The State of Oregon denied the permits and the certificate necessary for these projects.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the denial of these permits by the State of Oregon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is simple and straightforward. My amendment provides congressional disapproval of the denial of the Jordan Cove project permits.

The Jordan Cove project was an important liquefied natural gas proposal that would have been the only West Coast LNG export terminal and would have been essential to exporting LNG to our allies in the Pacific and freedom around the world.

The Department of Energy determined that the Jordan Cove project was expected to create 6,000 jobs during peak construction and generate up to \$100 million in State and local tax revenue annually.

Importantly, this project would have allowed us to export clean liquefied natural gas to our allies, many of which have been dependent on energy from Russia, OPEC, Venezuela, and even Iran.

America makes the cleanest energy around the world. In fact, our natural gas is 42 percent cleaner than Russian gas. American innovation, in particular, fracking, has allowed America to be the global leader in emissions since 2000.

In 2016, the United States Geological Survey released a report that increased the estimate of technically recoverable natural gas in the Mancos shale deposit from 1.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to a staggering 66.3 trillion, a 40-fold increase.

David Ludlam, who worked for the West Slope Colorado Oil and Gas Association, said, there is enough natural gas to power the State of California for 50 years right in Colorado's Third District's backyard, and the need for our community to join the global energy marketplace has never been more urgent.

A West Coast LNG export terminal would have shaved critical days and significant costs off exports to Asia, eliminated threats associated with hurricanes, and reduced our reliance on the Panama Canal, which causes significant uncertainty and delays.

We should be advancing energy infrastructure projects to help ensure Amer-

ican energy dominance and help promote economic growth through a true all-of-the-above energy policy, not having elected politicians and bureaucrats pick winners and losers in the energy sector.

Importantly, Jordan Cove has significant bipartisan support. In fact, the project in Colorado was supported by former-U.S. Senator Cory Gardner, U.S. Senator MICHAEL BENNET, former-Governor JOHN HICKENLOOPER, the Colorado Senate, the liberal Denver Post, the liberal Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, and local governments in western Colorado, including Mesa, Garfield, Rio Blanco, Moffat, Routt, Delta, and many other counties and municipalities in my region.

While similar project proposals have languished for decades, Jordan Cove was on track for success after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission granted two Federal permits for the Jordan Cove Energy Project and issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline in March of 2019.

Unfortunately, the anti-pipeline, anti-natural gas, liberal Governor's administration in Oregon denied the permits and the certificate necessary for these projects, essentially killing the project in December of 2021 when the company pulled out, citing their inability to obtain the necessary State permits in the immediate future.

If Green New Deal extremists in the Governor's office actually cared about the environment, they would have supported this project as natural gas emissions result in significantly fewer air pollutants and carbon dioxide emissions, and this important project would have advanced local, regional, and global emissions reduction goals.

Like the Keystone XL pipeline, Jordan Cove was a major opportunity killed by extreme environmentalists whose sole agenda isn't protecting the environment, isn't being good stewards of what we have been blessed with, but is keeping our American energy sources in the ground and killing off fossil fuels.

America deserves an American energy strategy that works for all Americans, and this amendment makes clear that we should not allow States with a misguided agenda to kill projects of national and global energy importance.

Mr. Chair, I support adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1600

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I hope after today we don't hear Republicans talk about States' rights again. Pipeline and LNG projects require both Federal and State permits. The spirit of the Clean Water Act clearly demands that States have a say in the requirements and permits that projects

in their State are subject to. This amendment disapproves of the State of Oregon's decision to deny permits to the Jordan Cove LNG export project.

Mr. Chair, who are we to disapprove of Oregon's decision?

I don't live in Oregon. The distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado offering this amendment doesn't live in Oregon. Oregon decided in a democratic fashion what standards projects had to meet in order to build in the State. Jordan Cove didn't meet those standards and it didn't get the permits and it didn't get built. I don't see anything objectionable there.

If Congress spent floor time debating every State decision that one Member of the House disagreed with, we would never get anything done. I just think this is a meaningless sense of Congress resolution. If this passes and the bill somehow becomes law, it won't bring the project back. It is really a messaging amendment, being added to, in my opinion, a messaging bill.

I would also note that my colleague, Congresswoman VAL HOYLE, staunchly opposes this amendment and has a long history of opposing the Jordan Cove LNG project. Unfortunately, she has come down with COVID and regrets that she is unable to be on the floor to discuss this amendment.

Republicans promised when they took the majority that they were going to be serious legislators dealing with actual issues the country is facing. I don't see that here.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HERN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:
SEC. 10017. STATE PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h-1(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Within ninety days” and inserting “(A) Within ninety days”;

(B) by striking “and after reasonable opportunity for presentation of views”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) If, after 270 calendar days of a State's application being submitted under paragraph

(1)(A) or notice being submitted under paragraph (1)(B), the Administrator has not, pursuant to subparagraph (A), by rule approved, disapproved, or approved in part and disapproved in part the State's underground injection control program—

“(i) the Administrator shall transmit, in writing, to the State a detailed explanation as to the status of the application or notice; and

“(ii) the State's underground injection control program shall be deemed approved under this section if—

“(I) the Administrator has not after another 30 days, pursuant to subparagraph (A), by rule approved, disapproved, or approved in part and disapproved in part the State's underground injection control program; and

“(II) the State has established and implemented an effective program (including adequate recordkeeping and reporting) to prevent underground injection which endangers drinking water sources.”;

(2) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) Before promulgating any rule under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection, the Administrator shall—

“(A) provide a reasonable opportunity for presentation of views with respect to such rule, including a public hearing and a public comment period; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register notice of the reasonable opportunity for presentation of views provided under subparagraph (A).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) PREAPPLICATION ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall work as expeditiously as possible with States to complete any necessary activities relevant to the submission of an application under paragraph (1)(A) or notice under paragraph (1)(B), taking into consideration the need for a complete and detailed submission.

“(6) APPLICATION COORDINATION FOR CLASS VI WELLS.—With respect to the underground injection control program for Class VI wells (as defined in section 40306(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 300h-9(a))), the Administrator shall designate one individual at the Agency from each regional office to be responsible for coordinating—

“(A) the completion of any necessary activities prior to the submission of an application under paragraph (1)(A) or notice under paragraph (1)(B), in accordance with paragraph (5);

“(B) the review of an application submitted under paragraph (1)(A) or notice submitted under paragraph (1)(B);

“(C) any reasonable opportunity for presentation of views provided under paragraph (4)(A) and any notice published under paragraph (4)(B); and

“(D) pursuant to the recommendations included in the report required under paragraph (7), the hiring of additional staff to carry out subparagraphs (A) through (C).

“(7) EVALUATION OF RESOURCES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the individual designated under paragraph (6) shall transmit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report, including recommendations, regarding the—

“(i) availability of staff and resources to promptly carry out the requirements of paragraph (6); and

“(ii) additional funding amounts needed to do so.

“(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘appropriate Congressional Committees’ means—

“(i) in the Senate—

“(I) the Committee on Environment and Public Works; and

“(II) the Committee on Appropriations; and

“(ii) in the House of Representatives—

“(I) the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and

“(II) the Committee on Appropriations.”.

(b) FUNDING.—In each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, amounts made available by title VI of division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act under paragraph (7) of the heading “Environmental Protection Agency—State and Tribal Assistance Grants” (Public Law 117-58; 135 Stat. 1402) may also be made available, subject to appropriations, to carry out paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as added by this section.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) apply to all applications submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency after the date of enactment of this Act to establish an underground injection control program under section 1422(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h-1); and

(2) with respect to such applications submitted prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the 270 and 300 day deadlines under section 1422(b)(2)(B) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as added by this section, shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I really hope this amendment can be bipartisan. I see no reason why it wouldn't be. It simply provides predictability for States applying for primacy of class 6 carbon capture wells. It is very straight forward. When a State submits a primacy application to the EPA, the EPA has 270 days to either approve or deny the application.

If the EPA is unable to do so within that generous time window, we give them another 30 days to explain why. If, for whatever reason, the EPA fails to make a determination after 300 days, then the State can move forward.

Importantly, we preserve EPA's ability to deny the application or revoke the approval using emergency measures under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Why is this needed?

Unfortunately, when States submit primacy applications for these wells, it can take years for the EPA to even bother to review the application. There is a lot more demand for carbon capture projects. They are ramping up around the country, especially in Houston. The need for expanded permitting capacity has greatly increased.

The EPA should not be the roadblock to projects that are designed to reduce carbon emissions. Let me say that again: Reduce carbon emissions.

The International Energy Agency said carbon capture is necessary to meet national, regional, and even corporate emissions reductions goals. Even EPA administrator Michael Regan called carbon capture a priority

for the Biden administration. It is a bipartisan issue.

States like Texas have already proven they can manage these wells and giving them primacy will be a game changer for speeding up carbon capture projects. Giving States regulatory certainty is critical to successful carbon capture projects moving forward in their States. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. Chair, there is no reason why this should not be bipartisan, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, the gentleman from Texas' amendment would undermine EPAs critical Underground Injection Control program and endanger the health of communities around the Nation, in my opinion.

The Underground Injection Control program, or UIC, regulates injection wells to protect drinking water sources.

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, EPA implements the program, but can delegate primary enforcement authority, or primacy, to a State.

To be granted primacy, States must demonstrate to EPA that they, among other things, have regulations in place that meet various minimum requirements.

The point of this application and EPA approval process is to ensure there is a Federal floor to regulations so drinking water is protected across the country.

This amendment seeks to expedite approvals of primacy applications by effectively rubber-stamping State UIC programs for class 6 wells, those used for carbon sequestration, if EPA hasn't acted on the State application within the review period.

Just like other permit deadline provisions of the polluters over peoples act, this would be dangerous.

While this amendment targets class 6 wells used for underground injection of carbon dioxide, the text, as written, would apply to State program applications or program revisions for all well types, including hazardous waste injection wells.

UIC programs should be rigorous and protective. We should not gamble with people's drinking water. Once water is contaminated, we cannot easily reverse course.

If Republicans care about the implementation of this program, they would support EPA as it works to ensure robust State programs are in place before granting primacy.

In fact, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law provided \$25 million toward that goal. So if States want primacy, they should complete the application process and be held to the Federal standard so Americans know their water is safe.

Circumventing this process will only put communities in jeopardy.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I have a brief response to the gentleman's remarks. This does not change at all the Safe Drinking Water Act that the EPA regulates. All it says is there is a timeline for that primacy application. It can always be denied within that timeline.

By the way, the entire point of this is to reduce carbon emissions. It should be bipartisan.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment with Congressman CRENSHAW.

The only thing dangerous about this is not implementing this, not moving at the speed of relevancy. That is what we are trying to accomplish here. I agree with my colleague from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW) that this should be bipartisan.

We should be allowing the States to do what they do to reduce those emissions. This amendment is critical to ensure the States can deploy carbon capture utilization and storage technologies.

As was mentioned, the Safe Drinking Water Act allows States to apply for primacy enforcement responsibility of underground injection control wells, including class 6 wells that are used for injection of CO₂ into the deep subsurface formations for long-term storage.

Only two States, North Dakota and Wyoming, currently have received a delegation of primary enforcement responsibility over class 6 wells. States' historic experience with handling these permits and the familiarity with their own geology translates to faster review times. It does not negatively impact drinking water. The freedom to craft those programs in a manner that makes sense the most should be relied upon at that local level.

Unfortunately, those applications for primacy are often held up with the EPA without any clarity. As you heard, those 270 days are completely unfortunate to moving at that speed of relevancy.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, to pass this, to let the States do what they can do to help not only drinking water, but emissions control.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, opposing this amendment would mean that you want more carbon emissions in the air, that you don't want carbon sequestration. I am pretty sure that is not what you all want. We all want the same thing here.

This is a commonsense amendment that simply expedites the permitting process, which is well established. Ev-

eryone knows it is safe. It doesn't change any regulations. It doesn't circumvent any EPA regulations or standards for drinking water at all.

This is a commonsense amendment. If we can't agree on things like this, it just tells me that we are looking for disagreement for the sake of disagreement. That makes me sad. It really does.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ESTES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:
SEC. 10017. USE OF INDEX-BASED PRICING IN ACQUISITION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS FOR THE SPR.

Section 160(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6240(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) as clauses (i) through (vi), respectively (and adjusting the margins accordingly);

(2) by striking "The Secretary shall" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall";

and

(3) by striking "Such procedures shall take into account the need to—" and inserting the following:

"(2) INCLUSIONS.—Procedures developed under this subsection shall—

"(A) require acquisition of petroleum products using index-based pricing; and

"(B) take into account the need to—".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, my amendment would protect our country and American families in the event of a national emergency by requiring the Department of Energy to refill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at a competitive market rate.

We all remember that President Biden chose to tap the SPR for political reasons as he tried to mask his failed energy policies that caused gas prices to soar. When President Biden took office, the average weekly price for a gallon of gas was \$2.38. It was already \$3.53 prior to Putin invading Ukraine before hitting record highs last summer. Despite depleting our SPR, we still have a weekly average of \$3.42.

Since draining the SPR to address an energy and inflation crisis of his own making, President Biden and his administration continue to abdicate their responsibility to replenish the reserve.

In October 2022, the White House announced it would implement a first-of-

its-kind rule establishing a system of fixed-price contracts for replenishing the SPR. Per the administration's policy, they intend to purchase crude oil for the SPR when prices are at or below about \$67 or \$72 per barrel.

The untested fixed-price bid system imposed by the White House has allowed the administration to ignore its responsibility to resupply the SPR to the detriment of the United States' economic and national security.

In January of this year, the DOE rejected bids from several producers to refill the SPR because the market rate for crude oil at the time was well above the administration's arbitrary fixed price. This deceptive policy gives the DOE a convenient excuse not to refill the SPR and keep it at record lows, leaving our Nation less safe and prepared.

My amendment would remedy this problem by requiring the DOE to use the commonly accepted index-based pricing bid process.

Historically, the index-based bid process is used to solicit contracts to refill the SPR and is a standard pricing regime used in the global oil and gas market. Using this more accepted metric, DOE would competitively bid at the market rate for crude oil when buying for the SPR.

This bidding system will ensure that DOE will meet its obligations to refill the SPR and not circumvent that obligation with an arbitrary price ceiling.

Further, the Federal Government should not be a speculator in the crude oil market. The fixed-price scheme dreamed up by the White House ignores the basic economic realities of how petroleum products are traded in the marketplace. If the administration is concerned about the price of oil not being a good deal for taxpayers, it should end its war on safe and reliable American energy.

My amendment would ensure the SPR refill bid process reflects market realities rather than the price mandates of the administration, and restores our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is desperately needed for our national security.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, frankly, I have no idea why this amendment is being offered. It would force the Department of Energy to ride the roller coaster that is the oil future's market, without any option to just pay a simple fixed price for a barrel of oil.

If oil goes up \$20 per barrel between when DOE purchases oil for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and when it is delivered, well, that is too bad. We are now paying \$20 per barrel more, and we will have to buy less oil.

This amendment unnecessarily restrains DOE and makes purchasing pe-

troleum products to refill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more expensive. DOE recognized as much when it issued a rulemaking last fall clarifying that it could purchase oil at a fixed price, as common sense would dictate.

There is no reason that it should be illegal for the Department of Energy to sign a contract saying that it will purchase oil for \$70 per barrel. No reason that I can think of. Except, of course, if you are an oil company that wants the Department of Energy to pay more to refill the reserve.

□ 1615

However, if you are an average American, then this amendment is a raw deal. It constrains the Department of Energy's usage of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is partially responsible for the tremendous over \$1.50 per gallon fall in the cost of gasoline we have seen since last summer's peak gas prices.

I will note that when the Department of Energy issued its notice of proposed rulemaking this last summer, industry did not object. In fact, the Department of Energy only received one comment on the rulemaking from Employ America, which was unambiguously positive.

That comment stated that the rule change "is an important step to reduce the volatility of oil prices over the short and medium term, improve our Nation's energy security, and a necessary step to ensure that acquisition procedures more fully align with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve's governing statute."

This amendment will put the usage of index pricing on par with the Department of Energy's duty to acquire petroleum products for the reserve as cheaply as possible. I don't understand that mission. It will only serve to diminish the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The amendment is necessary because it addresses the Biden administration's mismanagement of our Nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

President Biden has drained the SPR to the lowest levels since 1983. More than 40 percent has been liquidated in less than 2 years.

The Department of Energy has no meaningful plan to refill our strategic stockpile. Instead, the Department created new rules to allow it to use fixed-price bidding.

As we expected, the Biden administration's price-fixing scheme is failing. When DOE put out its bid, there were no takers.

The SPR is at its lowest level since 1983. We must replenish it as soon as

possible to protect our economy from a true supply interruption.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Chairman, this commonsense amendment restores the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to protect our Nation's security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment, as well as the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HERN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ESTES). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:

SEC. 10017. SENSE OF CONGRESS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED TAX HIKES ON THE OIL AND NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY IN THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that President Biden's fiscal year 2024 budget request proposes to repeal tax provisions that are vital to the oil and natural gas industry of the United States, resulting in a \$31,000,000,000 tax hike on oil and natural gas producers in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress disapproves of the proposed tax hike on the oil and natural gas industry in the President's fiscal year 2024 budget request.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, President Biden and congressional Democrats continue their attacks on traditional energy with proposed tax hikes that will kill jobs, raise fuel prices, and leave America more dependent on foreign oil.

This administration's proposed oil and natural gas tax hikes are harmful to our economy. The oil and natural gas industry accounts for 10.3 million jobs and is nearly 8 percent of our Nation's GDP.

This amendment shows it is the sense of Congress that we disapprove of this administration's proposed harmful tax hikes on the oil and gas industry.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be simultaneously concerned about high prices at the

pump while aggressively pursuing an agenda designed to entirely phase out oil and gas from domestic energy production. The audio simply doesn't match the video.

Uncertainty surrounding energy policy decisions in D.C. is causing oil and natural gas producers to make decisions based on unfavorable policies that haven't passed yet.

Repealing the immediate deduction of intangible drilling cost would cost 265,000 jobs. For every job lost in the oil and gas sector by repealing IDCs, two-and-one-half times as many indirect jobs are lost.

The percentage depletion deduction is the small business deduction for the smaller producers of oil and gas. Eliminating percentage depletion would force many family-owned small businesses to lay off employees or, worse, shut down operations altogether.

I am proud to support H.R. 1 to restore American energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of our colleagues to disapprove of President Biden's tax hikes on the oil and gas industry by supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I could not disagree more with this amendment. It claims that President Biden's budget would repeal tax breaks that are "vital to the oil and natural gas industry of the United States."

This is the same Big Oil that last year saw just six companies make a shocking \$200 billion in profit and then spend billions to enrich their shareholders with stock buybacks and dividends, all while gouging American drivers at the pump.

So, I hope the gentleman will forgive me if I don't think that Big Oil needs a tax break.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman offered this amendment because I think it is very illustrative of how Democrats and Republicans are in different places. Democrats and President Biden are fighting every day to keep Americans' Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid safe. Republicans, however, apparently only value the tax breaks that their Big Oil friends love.

Just yesterday, Speaker MCCARTHY sent President Biden a letter on the national debt, but I guess cutting tax breaks for fossil fuels is a real red line for Republicans. They would rather us default than impact their special interests.

It is fitting that this amendment is being added to the polluters over people act.

For all of my colleagues today, it is very simple. If you are on the side of the polluters, then support this amendment. If you are on the side of the people, then you must oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment expresses disapproval of the proposed tax hikes on the oil and gas industry in President Biden's 2024 budget. It is estimated that the President's budget request would result in a \$31 billion tax hike on the industry.

This is another move by this administration to harm the domestic oil and gas industry and undercut their global competitiveness despite asking them to produce more.

The independent oil and gas producers develop 91 percent of the wells in the United States, producing 83 percent of America's oil and 90 percent of its natural gas.

I think it is important to note that integrated companies don't get 100 percent of the tax break, only non-integrated companies. The small oil and gas producers that exist in western North Dakota, eastern Montana, Kansas, and Oklahoma that produce the majority of America's oil are the producers that the Biden administration wants to raise taxes on.

The Biden budget proposal also calls out these producers for failing to invest in production. Meanwhile, this administration is doing everything to tax and regulate the industry out of existence.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

SEC. 10017. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after section 163 (42 U.S.C. 6243) the following:

"SEC. 164. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prohibit the export or sale of petroleum products drawn down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, under any provision of law, to—

"(1) the People's Republic of China;
 "(2) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;
 "(3) the Russian Federation;
 "(4) the Islamic Republic of Iran;
 "(5) any other country the government of which is subject to sanctions imposed by the United States; and
 "(6) any entity owned, controlled, or influenced by—

"(A) a country referred to in any of paragraphs (1) through (5); or

"(B) the Chinese Communist Party.

"(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary may issue a waiver of the prohibition described in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that any export or sale authorized pursuant to the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

"(c) RULE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Lower Energy Costs Act, the Secretary shall issue a rule to carry out this section."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DRAWDOWN AND SALE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.—Section 161(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(a)) is amended by inserting "and section 164" before the period at the end.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 163 the following:

"Sec. 164. Prohibition on certain exports."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, while there is a great deal of divisive and partisan debate on the energy bill that is being considered this week, I rise to offer a bipartisan, commonsense, and straightforward amendment to protect U.S. national security in times of energy crisis.

The amendment closes a dangerous loophole that has existed since 2015 which allows our foreign adversaries to purchase our strategic oil supply.

As the law is currently written, oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve is sold by the Department of Energy to the highest bidder with few exceptions on what countries can purchase from the U.S. supply. That means that our fiercest adversaries, like China, Russia, Iran, or North Korea and other sanctioned governments, can purchase and export our strategic oil. In fact, companies owned by and affiliated with the Chinese Communist Party have won purchase contracts during the past two Presidential administrations.

Simply put, this loophole threatens our national security, and it poses serious harm to American families. The American people need Congress to act and to act quickly.

That is why I reached across the aisle to introduce the Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act with my colleague, Representative DON BACON. My amendment includes the straightforward and commonsense solution put forward by our bill. It prohibits the export or sale of the Strategic Petroleum

Reserve to China, North Korea, Russia, Iran, and any country currently under U.S. sanctions.

In January, my colleagues and I voted to pass a bill through the House of Representatives that would prohibit the sale of our strategic reserve to China, but that legislation does not go far enough.

Do we want North Korea buying American oil? How about Iran or Russia?

As a veteran and one of the most bipartisan Members of this body, my position remains clear. We must make sure that we put national security over party politics. We must ensure that our foreign adversaries are not allowed to profit at the expense of American safety and security.

My amendment reflects the fact that Congress has more work to do on this to close this dangerous loophole, not just for China but for any foreign adversary that poses a threat to our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats alike, to support this amendment and to include the bipartisan Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 118–30.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:
SEC. 10017. DOMESTIC ENERGY INDEPENDENCE REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to Congress a report that identifies and assesses regulations promulgated by the Administrator during the 15-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act that have—

- (1) reduced the energy independence of the United States;
- (2) increased the regulatory burden for energy producers in the United States;
- (3) decreased the energy output by such energy producers;
- (4) reduced the energy security of the United States; or
- (5) increased energy costs for consumers in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have proposed to the Lower Energy Costs Act will help Congress identify harmful regulations that have shut down American energy and increased costs on all Americans. This amendment instructs the EPA to identify and access existing regulations that have negatively impacted the United States' energy independence and energy security.

This amendment will provide transparency about the actions taken by the Biden administration to increase regulatory burdens for energy producers, diminish energy output for the United States, and raise the cost of energy for all Americans.

I grew up working in the west Texas oil fields, so I know firsthand that the best thing we can do for energy producers in our country is to get the Federal Government out of the way and reduce the number of burdensome regulations.

Unfortunately, from day one, President Biden has waged war on American energy and done everything in his power to undo all the incredible work of the Trump administration to make our country energy independent.

Since January 2021, the EPA has recklessly issued new rules and regulations with no regard for their adverse effects on Americans and our energy security.

They have continued to diminish America's energy independence and take aim at America's interests and citizens without meaningful consultation with industry leaders or a logical plan to move forward.

□ 1630

It is time we identify the EPA regulations that have played a direct role in shutting down our energy production and added additional expenses to the already burdensome day-to-day cost of living for Americans.

As many of my Republican colleagues have mentioned, H.R. 1 is just the beginning of our work on critical energy solutions that will lift the red tape and expand the production of affordable and reliable energy rather than hamstringing our domestic producers.

The underlying bill is a strong piece of legislation that will reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign energy sources and get us back on track to putting America first.

My amendment strengthens an already good bill and will allow Congress to pinpoint EPA regulations that negatively impact American families, small businesses, the agriculture industry, and our national security.

We must show Americans that we will not stand by while the EPA puts the needs of the environmental special interest groups ahead of the needs of the American people.

While some may wrongfully speak out against H.R. 1, this is an incredibly strong bill, and it is only the beginning of what the House majority is going to

accomplish to unleash American energy.

My amendment is a commonsense addition to the bill, and it instructs the EPA to conduct an after-action review to make sure we are doing what is in the best interests of our country.

I urge every Member in this body to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, the gentleman appears to be fixated on undermining key EPA safeguards put in place over the last 15 years under the guise of being too costly, while the history of environmental protection, especially under the Clean Air Act, shows this is simply untrue.

The United States can have both a clean environment and a strong economy. It is a false choice to assume otherwise. Republicans who claim that ambitious climate action and economic prosperity are at odds are simply ignoring the facts. This is the same argument that industry has used every time the Clean Air Act has been strengthened, and it has been debunked each and every time.

When Congress debated the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the oil industry said, "The technology to meet these standards simply does not exist today," and predicted major supply disruptions, while chemical companies said the law would cause severe economic and social disruption.

None of these gloom-and-doom predictions has ever come true. Instead, our air got cleaner, and our economy flourished.

The history of the Clean Air Act shows that the United States can reduce carbon pollution while creating jobs and strengthening our economy. Since its adoption in 1970, the Clean Air Act has reduced key air pollutants by roughly 78 percent, while the economy has almost quadrupled in size.

By EPA's own estimates, the benefits derived from the Clean Air Act exceed costs by a factor of more than 30–1. Let that sink in for a minute. Republicans like to claim that protecting Americans from pollution and tackling the climate crisis will sink the United States economy, but time and time again, we have seen that economic prosperity and environmental protection do go hand in hand.

The Clean Air Act has also made the United States the world leader in pollution control technology, generating hundreds of billions of dollars for U.S. companies and creating millions of jobs.

The standards targeted by this amendment are also widely popular: Clean car standards that help Americans drive cleaner and more fuel-efficient vehicles; mercury and air toxics standards that clean up deadly mercury and other hazardous air pollutants from power plants; and methane

standards for the oil and gas sector that are supported by industry.

The polluters over people act is the latest in a long line of sad attempts to undermine critical environmental and public health protections. These tired arguments continue to ring false and hollow. This amendment is more of the same.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose it and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer support for Representative JACKSON's amendment.

In Texas, across America, and deep in the waters off of our coastline rests an abundance of untapped energy. Through American ingenuity and technical innovations, we now have the ability to explore these natural resources and return the United States to its status as a net exporter of oil and natural gas.

Frankly, Mr. Chair, there are so many excessive regulations, we may need to limit the number of pages in this report we are asking for. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment requires the EPA Administrator and the Secretary of Energy to issue a report on harmful regulations that degrade our energy independence and raise costs for consumers. It requires the Biden administration take a hard look at how their own policies are hurting American consumers with high prices and less energy reliability.

The Biden administration has imposed harmful energy policies on American consumers since day one, such as canceling the Keystone XL pipeline and imposing a moratorium on oil and gas extraction on Federal lands.

We need to expand our American energy and our production, and I support this amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the support of my colleagues on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MACE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 9, insert the following:

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(A) the results of the ongoing assessments conducted under paragraph (1)(A);

(B) a description of any actions taken pursuant to the Department of Energy Organization Act to mitigate potential effects of critical energy resource supply chain disruptions on energy technologies or the operation of energy systems; and

(C) any recommendations relating to strengthening critical energy resource supply chains that are essential to the energy security of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, first off, I thank the leadership of our party and our Conference here today for H.R. 1 and for including some baseline text protecting the coastline of South Carolina.

South Carolina's beaches are paved with gold. We have clean air, clean water, a beautiful environment, beautiful trees, a beautiful landscape, beautiful beaches, and we were able to get baseline text in H.R. 1 this week that would protect our shoreline from offshore drilling.

There is no oil out there. We don't need to study it; we don't need to drill; we don't need to look for it. It does not exist, and the coast of South Carolina does not want it. I thank folks for including that in this legislation and protecting our coastline. My State of South Carolina is deeply appreciative of that in the baseline text.

This amendment really looks at the necessity to have an all-of-the-above strategy and approach to energy. Our policy should reflect our need to study and find uses for alternative energy sources, and that is what this amendment will do today.

This amendment requires the Secretary of Energy to report annually on ongoing assessments of alternative and renewable energy sources. It is needed to protect American energy security. As the world becomes more unstable, we need to rely on clean American energy right here at home and what other sources, alternative sources, of energy are available to us right here in the United States.

We need to ensure that we take steps to preserve the environment, as well as why we need an offshore drilling ban but also looking at alternative sources of energy.

Our overall goal here is to strengthen our supply chains and to advance American energy security with this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I choose not to speak in opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This section of H.R. 1 provides that the Department of Energy import new functions to identify the criteria of the energy resources, the minerals, and materials needed for our great American energy systems. It requires DOE to identify supply chain vulnerabilities, the vulnerabilities to supply disruptions by our adversaries like Russia and China, and it requires DOE to act to address risks to facilitate action across agencies, industry states, and to do something about them.

The amendment here by Representative MACE requires that DOE keep Congress informed in a timely manner of the risks to supply chains and the actions taken or that Congress may want to take to those risks. This is an important amendment to assist Congress and to keep the public informed of the energy security risks we face.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 10017. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on how banning natural gas appliances will affect the rates and charges for electricity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply requires a study to look at the impact that a ban on natural gas appliances would have on electricity prices.

In my home State of New York, Governor Kathy Hochul has proposed to implement a ban on gas-powered appliances, including gas stoves, beginning in 2025, less than just 2 years from now.

The notion that the State is going to tell New Yorkers that they can't use the most affordable option to heat their homes or cook their dinner is beyond belief. This proposal will undoubtedly increase the demand and cost for electricity, which is already incredibly expensive for my constituents in upstate New York, all spending hundreds, even thousands of dollars more for their electricity.

My amendment will shed light on the costs of Governor Hochul's proposal and what that cost will have on New Yorkers, and by extension, all Americans.

This is not a partisan issue. My Democratic colleagues should join me in seeking transparency and identifying the effects that this proposal and others like it will have on the cost of electricity.

H.R. 1, the bill in chief, delivers on our commitment to lower energy costs for the American people, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, let me reiterate what has been said before. Neither the Biden administration nor the Department of Energy is trying to ban gas stoves. No one is coming into your home to remove that stove. I implore my colleagues across the aisle to stop lying to the American people about this. Apparently, Republicans think that standards to make something better, to make it more efficient, is a ban.

Regardless, this amendment makes no sense. This amendment calls for a study on how banning natural gas appliances will affect rates and charges for electricity. As I said, no one is actually talking about a ban, but the funny thing is we already know that electrification does result in lowering energy bills.

Electric appliances like heat pumps save households money because they are more efficient than gas appliances. Especially as we see fuel prices rise, electrification becomes even more critical, more important.

Republicans see the tide turning against their friends in the oil and gas industry, so how do they respond?

With a big energy package and a bunch of amendments that attempt to lock Americans into a dirty, expensive fossil fuel choice.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With due respect to all my colleagues, there is a State that is proposing to ban gas appliances. In fact, New York is not only planning to ban simply through new construction, but will require that transition within 2 years, even retrofitting or making changes to construction of existing homes.

In the case of New York, we know already we shoulder the highest burden, highest cost of not only taxation and electricity costs, but this will just add insult to injury. I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

□ 1645

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. The Biden administration will stop at nothing in its war on American energy.

Democrats' next target is Americans' home appliances, including stoves, your furnace, and your hot water heater.

In the last 2 years, we have seen far-reaching regulatory proposals and executive orders to restrict the use of natural gas.

As we speak, DOE is proposing to ban more than half of the gas stoves currently on the market. Some States, like California and New York, are going even further to ban natural gas pipelines and the sale of gas-powered appliances and equipment.

The American people are paying for these gas bans in the form of higher prices and surging utility bills. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment so that the GAO can study the true cost of gas bans.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 10017. GAS KITCHEN RANGES AND OVENS.

The Secretary of Energy may not finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the pro-

posed rule titled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Conventional Cooking Products; Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking and announcement of public meeting" (88 Fed. Reg. 6818; published February 1, 2023) with respect to energy conservation standards for gas kitchen ranges and ovens, or any substantially similar rule, including any rule that would directly or indirectly limit consumer access to gas kitchen ranges and ovens.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Energy are threatening access to gas stoves for millions of Americans through the rulemaking process.

In fact, the DOE admits that up to 50 percent of all gas stoves currently on the market or in use in American households will not meet the proposed standards.

This amendment would stop the DOE from imposing this regulation. According to the DOE's own analysis, in 2020, 38 percent of Americans used natural gas to cook in their homes.

The Energy Information Administration says cooking with gas is three times cheaper than cooking with electricity.

The American people see this for what it is; a direct attack on all natural gas use in the country and another example of the Biden administration's desire to control every decision we make. Moreover, this rule is essentially a tax on consumers who are already being squeezed by inflation.

My Democratic colleagues would argue that these rules were crafted for the purpose of saving consumers money.

The DOE estimates the regulation would reduce energy use by 3.4 percent, resulting in a savings of only \$21.89 over a gas range's life span. That is \$1.45 per year over an average life span of 15 years for a gas range.

These miniscule savings indicate this regulation is really not about the consumers' pocketbooks; it is about Federal control at the behest of radical green energy groups who want the complete elimination of the use of natural gas.

I will point out were this to happen, there would be far less food to cook because natural gas is essential to fertilizer for food crops. Its elimination would cut food production in half worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I will start by saying I have good news for my colleagues across the aisle.

The Department of Energy isn't banning gas stoves. It doesn't even have the authority to ban gas stoves. This amendment, like this whole bill, is political messaging.

What DOE is doing is proposing a standard to make new residential gas stoves more efficient and cut gas waste, not to ban them.

The proposed standard is so reasonable that half of the current models already meet it, including all entry-level models.

They already meet the standard, and for those that don't meet the standard, manufacturers have until 2027 to upgrade their product line, so this really isn't anything outrageous.

Also, DOE is required by law to review and update standards for appliances like refrigerators and air conditioning units.

DOE is actually late with this stove standard. It was supposed to be completed in 2017, but we are glad they are working on it now.

Models that meet the proposed standard consume 30 percent less energy than the least efficient models on the market. That is, indeed, significant.

The full proposed rule, which also includes updated standards for electric and gas residential stoves and ovens, would result in up to \$1.7 billion worth in savings for United States consumers and avert about 22 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions over 30 years of sales.

I stand in deep opposition to this amendment. This amendment would bar DOE from finalizing any future efficiency standards for gas stoves, locking consumers into less efficient appliances that are certainly more costly to use.

This is just political fearmongering. It is a waste of our time, and I do urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the fact that my Democratic colleague admitted that half the stoves do not meet the standard.

When he says that half already meet it, you know, by my math, the other half doesn't.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment shows the clear difference in the vision between House Republicans and the Biden administration and my Democratic colleagues' views on these things.

Their claim that this regulation will save American households money is another painful example of how bad they are on math.

House Republicans believe in American energy abundance, and the administration believes in energy restrictions.

We believe in consumer choice, and the administration believes in heavy-handed government mandates.

We believe that consumers back home should make their own decisions, while the administration believes Fed-

eral bureaucrats should decide what Americans can and can't do on a daily basis, including what they can use to cook their families' meals.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The amendment would stop the Department of Energy from implementing punitive regulations to ban natural gas stoves.

Earlier this year, we learned that the Biden administration was considering a nationwide ban on gas stoves when Consumer Product Safety Commissioner Trumka said gas stoves were a hidden hazard, and all options are on the table to restrict their use.

Weeks later, the DOE issued a proposed efficiency rule that would ban up to 96 percent of existing stoves on the market.

DOE's punitive regulations to ban gas stoves is a massive expansion of their statutory authority. DOE should be focused on expanding energy options rather than banning them.

DOE's regulatory assault will force the American people to change out their reliable gas stoves for more expensive and less reliable electric appliances.

This amendment would stop DOE from banning those gas stoves, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk that has been approved by the Rules Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 24, insert the following:

(c) REGULATION OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING WITHIN THE SUSQUEHANNA, DELAWARE, AND POTOMAC RIVER BASINS.—Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) REGULATION OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91-575 (84 Stat. 1509), the Delaware River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Pub-

lic Law 87-328 (75 Stat. 688), or the Potomac River Basin Compact to which consent was given by Public Law 91-407 (84 Stat. 856), the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, as applicable, may not finalize, implement, or enforce any regulation relating to hydraulic fracturing that is issued pursuant to any authority other than that of the State in which the regulation is to be implemented or enforced.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the unelected and unaccountable Delaware River Basin Commission, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River from improving hydraulic fracturing regulations more stringent, more stringent than those passed by the duly-elected State representatives and Senate in which the regulation is to be implemented or enforced.

According to the Energy Information Administration, last year, residential natural gas prices were the highest on record. That is awesome. I am sure consumers love that.

The best way to combat these record-high prices is with more competition; simply, more supply and demand. It is to produce more natural gas in America in places like my home State of Pennsylvania, the second-largest natural gas producer in the Nation.

Unfortunately, again, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the Delaware River Basin Commission have instituted a hydraulic fracturing ban for a portion of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, stripping away property rights and mineral rights from Pennsylvanians in contravention of the will of their very own legislature.

The result is a prohibition on the development of critical shale plays in eastern Pennsylvania that can bring desperately needed natural gas to market and the unconstitutional taking of mineral rights of all Pennsylvanians.

Using this playbook, radical environmentalists and unelected bureaucrats will next prevent hydraulic fracturing in the Susquehanna River Basin and the Potomac River Basin, as well.

The threat of this expansion undermines investor confidence and exploration and development projects throughout the Commonwealth and further restricts domestic natural gas production.

To be clear, this amendment simply clarifies that these three commissions cannot impose restrictions more stringent than those passed by the State in which the regulation is being implemented or enforced.

It makes no changes to the ability of States to regulate hydraulic fracturing as they see fit, as their legislatures see fit, as their citizens see fit. This means

it would have zero impact on existing fracturing bans in the State of New York.

Instead, this amendment simply makes clear that Pennsylvanians can use their property and mineral rights as they see fit, subject to the Pennsylvania laws passed by their elected representatives, the way it is supposed to be done.

Enough is enough already. It is time to stop this underhanded attack on property rights, representative government, and State sovereignty and restore American energy security.

Opposition to this amendment is support for a hydraulic fracturing ban and for higher natural gas prices for your constituents and your citizens.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and rein in these unelected bureaucrats waging war on Americans in their very homes and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FITZGERALD). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Delaware River Basin Commission is made up of representatives from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and my home State of New Jersey.

The commission oversees drinking water quality for the Delaware River Watershed, a vitally important role that impacts millions of people across four States.

Congress created the commission over 60 years ago and gave it powers to regulate the Delaware River Watershed.

Crucially, each State's democratically elected leaders signed up to join the commission, and each State receives a vote on the commission.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, the commission banned fracking in its watershed, and this wasn't a controversial decision.

In fact, it was unanimous. It was a 4-0 vote to help protect the public health of the 13 million citizens in the watershed and to preserve the waters themselves.

Today, Republicans want to retroactively take away the rights of the citizens of these four States and their elected representatives. They want to take away the powers that Congress gave the commission just because they don't like the outcome.

I would suggest this: If you really care about clean rivers and waters, I urge you to oppose this amendment. If you care about people's rights to safe drinking water, I urge you to oppose this amendment.

I would like to think that all my colleagues care about these things, so I urge opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gen-

tleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Mr. PERRY's amendment makes very clear that the States have primacy for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing for oil and natural gas production on State and private lands.

We cannot allow unelected bureaucrats or independent commissions to prohibit oil and gas production activities that are safe and permitted under State law.

The Biden administration and radical environmentalists are waging a war on American energy, and they want to ban hydraulic fracturing.

The United States has become the world's number one energy producer thanks in part to technological innovations like hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling.

According to a recent study placing a moratorium on fracking would mean a \$900 billion increase in U.S. household energy costs, \$7.1 trillion in potential losses to the U.S. economy through 2030, and over 7 million fewer U.S. jobs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment and standing up for American energy and American energy workers.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, if you don't want to vote for this, I get it. You can tell your constituents at home that you stand for people that are unelected. Most folks at home have never even heard of the Delaware River Basin Commission. They don't even know about interstate compacts.

Here is what they know: They want to live their lives, and they want to vote for elected officials to make decisions that are important to them. If it is so dangerous, how come it is banned here but not there? In the rest of Pennsylvania, we do it.

Mr. Chairman, this is just taking the people's rights away, their voices away from their elected officials, and it is literally the definition of tyranny.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Governors are the four commissioners. The Governor of Pennsylvania is the chairman of the commission. They may delegate to someone to actually go to the meetings, but they are making these decisions.

I don't understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that we should take away the rights of the Governors who are on these commissions to make the decision that was a 4-0 decision. If they decide that they want something different in the Delaware watershed than in their individual States, that is their prerogative, but they made this decision. They voted 4-0.

Again, I don't see the point, and I think it is really egregious for us to take away the powers of the Governors, as they are elected by the people of the

four States to make this decision about fracking within their watershed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that has been approved by the Rules Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of division A the following:
SEC. 10017. ENERGY SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “sections 126 and 115 (relating to interstate and international pollution abatement)” and inserting “section 126 (relating to interstate pollution abatement)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment repeals section 115 of the Clean Air Act. This vital amendment protects the autonomy of the States over their own energy sectors by ensuring that unelected, unaccountable EPA bureaucrats cannot seize control over these vital industries under the guise of emissions reductions.

The Constitution clearly reserves this power to the States, and it is long overdue that we bring Federal policies back in line with the very Constitution that we swore an oath to.

Section 115 gives EPA the authority to impose emission reductions on the States if the administrator finds, based on the word of some international organization—just based on their good word—that American air pollution endangers the public health and welfare of another country. Imagine if we could do that to China? The administrator determines that that country will lower their emissions a commensurate amount.

Put a different way, section 115 allows the EPA to rely on the credibility of the same international elites who misled us about COVID to force our

constituents to change every aspect of their lives because some European nation thought it would be great to do the same thing. Now, we would have to do the same thing.

This is no longer a hypothetical.

Since President Biden reentered the Paris climate agreement, it can be argued that these conditions have been met and EPA can immediately impose devastating requirements as it was argued when the Obama administration first entered the agreement. Subjecting such an important sector of our economy to the whims of foreign bureaucrats is downright reckless and hands U.S. sovereignty over to a foreign ideology—not even foreign governments, just foreign bureaucrats.

Removing the broadly written language in section 115 is the only way to prevent the delegation of nearly unlimited power over State energy sectors to the EPA bureaucrats and removes the ability of international organizations to meddle in our energy sector.

It is vital that we prevent this Federal power grab before it imposes devastating economic consequences by empowering the States to meet the needs and interests of their own citizens.

Language to prevent the use of section 115 of the Clean Air Act has passed the House three times under Republican majorities: Twice in the 115th Congress and once in the 114th.

To those who view this amendment as premature because the administration has not yet acted under section 115, the impact was never questioned in the past. How many times do we have to wake up and say, well, I didn't think they would do it? I didn't think they would actually defund the police. I didn't think they would have the IRS show up at the guy's house when he was testifying in Congress.

Heaven forbid, I didn't believe they would actually try and ban my gas stove. I thought they were just kidding around. They didn't really mean it. They do mean it.

We know the administration is going to do so because the radical environmental groups that control their agenda have come out and said it.

Here are a couple examples. The League of Conservation Voters: "While there has been limited use of section 115, numerous scholars have advocated for its use as a pathway to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly since the Paris Agreement."

How about Foreign Policy for America: This amendment would undermine EPA's authority for "its potential future applications to greenhouse gases." Yeah, we want to undermine their authority and make the authority of the States preeminent. The authority of citizens should be preeminent.

Preemptively removing this authority from the administration before they can act is vital to U.S. sovereignty and our economic well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the Perry amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, a common refrain that I hear from Republicans is that unilateral action by the United States to reduce greenhouse gases would harm our economy and wouldn't move the needle on reducing global emissions. The core of this argument is that if we are going to address climate change, we need to coordinate an international response.

Of course, this argument completely falls apart when you take a look at the actions of the House Republicans. Many cheered as the previous administration removed the United States from the Paris Agreement. Exiting the largest international agreement to combat global climate change not only weakened our diplomatic standing abroad, but it made it abundantly clear that Republicans don't care about addressing climate change.

Now, thankfully, President Biden rejoined the Paris Agreement, putting that embarrassing chapter behind us, but it appears that House Republicans want to go back to burying their heads in the sand when it comes to combating climate change, as was made clear by this amendment.

This amendment would repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act, which provides EPA with a tool to address air pollution while promoting international cooperation to combat climate change.

As my Republican colleagues should know by now, air pollution does not respect boundaries, whether these are State or international. Section 115 provides the EPA administrator the authority to set limits on an air pollutant that is harming public health and welfare in another country as long as the other country grants reciprocal rights to the United States.

The gentleman's amendment would remove this discretionary authority, gutting our ability to cooperate with our neighbors. We have agreements with Canada and with Mexico, and we show leadership with the international community by working with our neighbors to try to deal with air pollution.

Climate change is a global problem. We need to work with other nations like we worked with Canada and Mexico and provide the leadership to encourage international engagements to tackle this crisis.

I have to say: I don't believe the Republican majority wants to act on climate crisis internationally or domestically. Case in point, the polluters over people act we are dealing with today. It attempts to repeal popular provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act: The greenhouse gas reduction fund, the methane emissions reduction program, and \$4.5 billion in home electrification rebates.

Now, House Democrats took historic action to combat the climate crisis by

passing the Inflation Reduction Act, which included unparalleled investments in climate and clean energy.

Not a single House Republican voted for it, but if we can't act domestically and we can't act in coordination with our neighbors, even Canada and Mexico, what are we going to do to address the threat caused by the climate crisis?

According to this amendment, the answer is apparently nothing. We are not going to do anything domestically. We are not going to do anything with our neighbors. We are not going to do anything internationally. We are going to do nothing. I just think that is unacceptable.

At a time of real crisis, as highlighted by the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report, we should empower EPA to combat dangerous climate change and strongly encourage other nations to do the same. We shouldn't be taking any tools off the table, and that is what this amendment does. It takes the tool off the table.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), since I know he wants to speak favorably about me.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, before I start, I will point out that it sounds like we want to cooperate with our foreign neighbors when it comes to environmental control, but we don't want to import energy from them or we don't want to export energy to them. I find that a little bit ironic.

That being said, I regretfully stand in opposition to this amendment.

After Congress reviewed and preserved the Clean Air Act in 1977, it did play an important role in cross-border pollution issues of the late 1970s with Canada. Before we strike an entire section of the Clean Air Act involving air pollutants, the committee of jurisdiction should examine the issues, particularly to make sure we avoid any unintended consequences.

For example, we should make sure that striking this section does not undermine the ability to reduce international air emissions that harm the United States.

I commit to working with my friend from Pennsylvania to take this through regular order, but I am a big fan of the committee process. Let's see that it works.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 36, after line 3, insert the following:

(j) WITHDRAWAL OF POLICY STATEMENTS.—The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall withdraw—

(1) the updated policy statement titled “Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Facilities” published in the Federal Register on March 1, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 11548); and

(2) the interim policy statement titled “Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Natural Gas Infrastructure Project Reviews” published in the Federal Register on March 11, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 14104).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering here directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, as we refer to it, to withdraw two policy statements that massively expand the role of climate hysteria in certification of natural gas infrastructure, like pipelines and LNG export terminals.

In February 2022, FERC released two radical policy statements that massively increased the role that the emissions play in its certification of natural gas pipelines and LNG export terminals, which are so critical to our ability to affect world consumption of gas so that we can drive down CO₂ and expand our role in the world and expand American energy interests.

This included requiring FERC to consider the upstream and downstream impact on emissions that building a new natural gas pipeline would have.

Even Senator MANCHIN said: “The Commission went too far by prioritizing a political agenda over their main mission—ensuring our Nation’s energy reliability and security.”

I want everybody to hear this. This move by FERC came 1 week before Russia invaded Ukraine. This administration is perfectly fine empowering our enemies to appease the climate activists, the climate cult. We saw it with Nord Stream 2. We see it right here.

We refuse to expand American energy right when we could be sticking it to Putin. Instead, we have everybody over here clamoring about what we need to do in Ukraine instead of having gotten in front of that by exporting American energy, by making sure that we control

the world’s supply of energy by putting out clean-burning American natural gas.

Just 1 week after FERC made this move, Russia invaded Ukraine, massively disrupting European natural gas supplies.

When the Western world was begging for U.S. LNG, this administration was giving them the middle finger to appease the climate cult.

Meanwhile, our enemies—China, Iran, Russia, Venezuela—are massively pumping out emissions. China has 1,100 coal-fired plants. They are adding two a week. We are not adding squat to our natural gas or coal production capacity.

Texas is about to be 50 percent wind and solar because we refuse to actually produce the coal and gas necessary to have power on a cloudy, windless day.

China accounts for 30 percent of global emissions—and increasing. Russian natural gas exports to Europe release 41 percent more emissions than U.S. LNG.

Bottom line: This administration’s war on U.S. energy will not do a thing to help the environment but will hurt freedom and prosperity here and abroad.

We should accept this amendment. This amendment should be agreed to across the spectrum because it is good for American oil and gas. It is good for the world. It will actually help drive down CO₂ while making our country stronger and helping us push back on Russia in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I frankly don’t understand the purpose of this amendment.

Last spring, FERC issued an updated policy statement, an interim guidance, detailing how the Commission should treat new applications for natural gas pipelines and account for greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission, a month later, clarified that both documents were drafts and that it would seek further input and comments on the drafts. That is it.

These documents are not final rules or orders from the Commission. They are not law. They are a draft, draft documents that the Commission has put out to solicit industry and stakeholder feedback, and that is the way we want the government to work for it to be responsive.

Withdrawing these documents from draft status, which is what I think the gentleman’s amendment would do, would have no impact on any policy and, instead, I think, would just create further confusion and possibly release FERC from the duty to consider industry’s comments on the draft.

It may be that the real reason that the Republicans offered this amend-

ment is that they don’t think that FERC should consider greenhouse gas emissions. They don’t think that these emissions should matter when FERC makes a decision about whether or not to authorize a new natural gas pipeline.

This doesn’t change the law. The law currently requires FERC to consider the greenhouse gas impacts of a certificate it grants. Multiple Federal court rulings have held that the agency must think about these issues based on the statute, and the interim policy statement was meant to create certainty for industry on how the Commission would do that.

Instead, Republicans want to send FERC and, frankly, all parts of the Federal Government back into confusion. If you want to say that FERC shouldn’t consider greenhouse gases—I am not in favor of that—you should amend the statute to say that.

By simply saying that these draft rules should be withdrawn, that is going to tell industry, how do you deal with this? How are they going to know what to do if there are no rules, no policy, no input from them whatsoever?

I think it would be wrong to change the statute to say that they shouldn’t take greenhouse gas impacts into consideration, but that is not what this amendment does. This amendment says to just get rid of these drafts, and then industry would have no input into any of this. I don’t think industry would support that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the previous speaker. I think this draft amendment was designed to have certainty. I think it was designed to have certainty, in that no new pipelines would get put into the ground.

By mitigating both upstream and downstream carbon, if anybody who understands the way economics of a pipeline work, not only are you delaying this process even further, which is what H.R. 1 is trying to constrict, but you will make it nearly impossible and not economically viable to get pipe in the ground.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is an energy economic regulator, not a climate regulator.

This is a good amendment. It will take draft language that had no business being introduced to begin with and remove it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I agree with my friend (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no issues with the fact that they were amending these drafts and leaving it in draft form, we just want to give the certainty of saying to remove these. They were clearly a bad idea.

That is exactly what Senator MANCHIN was saying. Let's not go down this road.

This is the problem with FERC. FERC is becoming a radical organization that is inserting itself in places where it does not belong. When the executive branch oversteps its bounds, it is incumbent upon Congress, in Article I, to do something about it.

We are simply saying to pull these. Admit that this was a foolish direction to go, and let's ensure that we are sending a strong signal that we are pro-pipeline, pro-moving American LNG and making sure that we are exporting energy to the world that is actually clean burning and will help our economy, help push back on Putin, not make us reliable on China, and make us a heck of a lot stronger.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, FERC is not radical. There is a statute that says that FERC has to consider greenhouse gas emissions. They put out a policy statement about how they are going to do that and asked for the industry to look at it and give their input.

All this amendment does is to say to put that aside. Then how does the FERC—do they just issue another draft saying here is another way to look at it?

I just think this is very confusing. I do think FERC should take into consideration greenhouse gas emissions. They are required to by the law.

Unless the gentleman is going to change that, it makes no sense to say that they can't get industry input about how they do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is the Chair's understanding that amendment No. 14 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in Part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 20309 the following:

SEC. 20310. PERMIT PROCESS FOR PROJECTS RELATING TO EXTRACTION, RECOVERY, OR PROCESSING OF CRITICAL MATERIALS.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED PROJECT.—Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii)(III), by striking “; or” and inserting “;”;

(2) in clause (iv)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) is related to the extraction, recovery, or processing from coal, coal waste, coal

processing waste, pre-or post-combustion coal byproducts, or acid mine drainage from coal mines of—

“(I) critical minerals (as such term is defined in section 7002 of the Energy Act of 2020);

“(II) rare earth elements; or

“(III) microfine carbon or carbon from coal.”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report evaluating the timeliness of implementation of reforms of the permitting process required as a result of the amendments made by this section on the following:

(1) The economic and national security of the United States.

(2) Domestic production and supply of critical minerals, rare earths, and microfine carbon or carbon from coal.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which is imperative to bringing home an essential supply chain and protecting our national security, all while protecting the environment.

Rare earth elements and critical minerals are essential components in the daily lives of Americans, as well as in national security technology from home computers, televisions, and vehicles, to major weapons systems, including lasers, guided missile systems, jet engines, and alloys for armored vehicles.

Currently, China controls the bulk of the global supply of these critical minerals and rare earths that support America's economy and defense industrial base.

The demand for these minerals will steadily increase as the global economy adopts new technologies, placing the United States and its allies at a growing disadvantage unless steps are taken to shift production and sourcing away from Chinese Communist Party-controlled entities.

The risk of supply disruptions is amplified by U.S. dependence on unreliable foreign sources and red tape that disincentivizes domestic sourcing.

It is estimated that 80 percent of rare earth minerals in the United States come from China. For too long, bureaucratic red tape and uncertainty in the permitting process forced critical mineral and rare earth operations overseas.

This amendment works to jump-start American critical mineral, rare-earth element, and carbon production to make our supply chains more resilient while creating opportunities for coal and coal byproducts to be used in new, clean, and innovative ways.

According to Bureau of Land Management estimates, there are nearly

5,200 coal-related abandoned mine sites that have yet to be fully reclaimed. Through this amendment, we are creating an avenue for rare earths to be extracted from coal waste at these abandoned mine sites.

This would not only help the United States with this critical supply chain need but also address our Nation's environmental and reclamation needs.

□ 1730

Specifically, this amendment would include projects related to extraction, recovery, or processing of critical minerals, rare earth elements, or carbon from coal, coal waste, coal processing waste, or pre- or post-combustion coal byproducts, or acid mine drainage from coal mines as covered projects eligible for FAST-41 permitting for the purposes of securing the economic and national security of the United States.

Mr. Chair, whether you are like me, a member of the Congressional Coal Caucus or a member of the Sustainable Energy Caucus or a national security hawk or a member of the Select Committee on Strategic Competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, every Member of Congress should be for this win-win solution, a win to reclaim these abandoned mine sites and fix an environmental problem, a win for the coal industry and the workers in the coal industry who need alternatives to combustion of coal now that we are in the transition phase of our energy development in our country, and certainly a win for national security. This is a way for us to end overdependence on the Chinese Communist Party for critical, national security sensitive supply chain needs.

The United States must innovate and secure its supply chain of sensitive strategic materials in order to reduce reliance on Chinese Communist Party-controlled materials overseas.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote “aye” on my amendment, which I expect to be fully bipartisan, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, House Democrats filed several amendments to H.R. 1 that would help mitigate some of the outright damage to our climate, our communities, and our economic future that this bill would cause.

Unfortunately, only 7 out of 95 were made in order to get an open debate and an up-or-down vote.

Some Republicans have also filed amendments that I support. But I am afraid that at the end of the day, there is ultimately no path forward for making H.R. 1 any semblance of a legislative proposal that the American people, not polluters, deserve.

The polluters over people act will actively and aggressively take us backward regarding emissions and in our

transition to clean energy. It guts our bedrock environmental laws and takes communities out of the permitting process entirely, the public's right to know. Some of the Republican amendments add to that mess.

To start, I rise today in opposition to this amendment, which would make a harmful bill even worse by arbitrarily eroding community protections under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

This amendment greatly expands the limited environmental review standards of the 2015 FAST Act to a series of coal waste extraction activities that can cause significant environmental damage and warrant strong environmental review standards.

There is already a deliberate process in place under the FAST Act to expand its limited environmental review standards to new types of projects under certain conditions. This amendment is a legislative end run around that deliberative process that inappropriately curtails public input, environmental review, and judicial review under NEPA.

At its most basic level, NEPA simply requires government agencies to assess significant environmental and public health impacts before a decision is made and potentially harmful activities like coal waste extraction begin. NEPA doesn't stop these activities. It simply assures that their impacts are considered and that the public knows.

This amendment undermines the basic purposes of NEPA. I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-30 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. MOLINARO of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118-30 offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—221

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Garbarino	Millers
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Molinaro
Amodei	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Arrington	González-Colón	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Baird	Gosar	Moylan
Balderson	Granger	Murphy
Banks	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Barr	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Norman
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Griffith	Obernolte
Bice	Grothman	Ogles
Biggs	Guest	Owens
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Pence
Boebert	Harris	Perry
Bost	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Brecheen	Hern	Radewagen
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hudson	Rose
Burlison	Huizenga	Rosendale
Calvert	Hunt	Rouzer
Cammack	Issa	Roy
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carl	James	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Santos
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kiley	Smucker
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Staubert
Curtis	LaHood	Steel
D'Esposito	LaLota	Stefanik
Davidson	LaMalfa	Steil
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Steube
DesJarlais	Langworthy	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Strong
Donalds	LaTurner	Tenney
Duarte	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Timmons
Edwards	Letlow	Turner
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Valadao
Emmer	Lucas	Van Drew
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Van Dуйne
Ezell	Luna	Van Orden
Fallon	Luttrell	Wagner
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Walberg
Ferguson	Mann	Waltz
Finstad	Massie	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Mast	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McClain	Westerman
Flood	McClintock	Williams (NY)
Foxx	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Scott	Meuser	Wittman
Fry	Miller (IL)	Womack
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	Yakym
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	Zinke

NOES—208

Adams	Barragán	Blunt Rochester
Aguilar	Beatty	Bonamici
Allred	Bera	Bowman
Auchincloss	Beyer	Boyle (PA)
Balint	Bishop (GA)	Brown

Brownley	Horsford	Pettersen
Budzinski	Houlahan	Phillips
Bush	Huffman	Pingree
Caraveo	Ivey	Plaskett
Carbajal	Jackson (IL)	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jackson (NC)	Porter
Carson	Jackson Lee	Posey
Carter (LA)	Jacobs	Pressley
Cartwright	Jayapal	Quigley
Casar	Jeffries	Ramirez
Case	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Casten	Kamlager-Dove	Ross
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cherfilus	Keating	Ruppersberger
McCormick	Khanna	Ryan
Chu	Kildee	Sablan
Cicilline	Kilmer	Salinas
Clark (MA)	Kim (NJ)	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kuster	Scanlon
Connolly	Landman	Schakowsky
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Courtney	Lee (NV)	Scholten
Craig	Lee (PA)	Schrier
Crockett	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)
Crow	Levin	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lieu	Sherman
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Sherrill
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Slotkin
Davis (NC)	Mace	Smith (WA)
Dean (PA)	Magaziner	Sorensen
DeGette	Manning	Soto
DeLauro	Matsui	Spanberger
DelBene	McBath	Stansbury
Deluzio	McClellan	Stanton
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Stevens
Dingell	McGarvey	Strickland
Doggett	McGovern	Swalwell
Escobar	Meeks	Sykes
Eshoo	Menendez	Takano
Espallat	Meng	Thanedar
Evans	Mfume	Thompson (CA)
Fitzpatrick	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Fletcher	Morelle	Titus
Foster	Moskowitz	Tlaib
Foushee	Moulton	Tokuda
Frankel, Lois	Mrvan	Tonko
Frost	Mullin	Torres (CA)
Gallego	Nadler	Torres (NY)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Trahan
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Trone
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Underwood
Garcia, Robert	Nickel	Vargas
Golden (ME)	Norcross	Vasquez
Goldman (NY)	Norton	Veasey
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Velázquez
Gonzalez,	Omar	Wasserman
Vicente	Pallone	Schultz
Gottheimer	Panetta	Waters
Green, Al (TX)	Pappas	Watson Coleman
Grijalva	Pascrell	Wild
Harder (CA)	Payne	Williams (GA)
Hayes	Peltola	Wilson (FL)
Higgins (NY)	Perez	
Himes	Peters	

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Hoyle (OR)	Sewell
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Wexton
Cohen	Lee (CA)	

□ 1801

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, LANDSMAN, and Ms. MACE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chair, I regret that I was not able to be present for rollcall No. 167 on agreeing to the amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 167.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HERN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CAREY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 118-

30 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—228

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	McCormick
Alford	Scott	McHenry
Allen	Fry	Meuser
Allred	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Amodei	Gallagher	Miller (OH)
Armstrong	Garbarino	Miller (WV)
Arrington	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Babin	Gimenez	Mills
Bacon	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Baird	González-Colón	Moolenaar
Balderson	Good (VA)	Mooney
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Barr	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Bean (FL)	Granger	Moran
Bentz	Graves (LA)	Moylan
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Bice	Green (TN)	Nehls
Biggs	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Bilirakis	Griffith	Norman
Bishop (NC)	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Boebert	Guest	Obernolte
Bost	Guthrie	Ogles
Brecheen	Hageman	Owens
Buchanan	Harris	Palmer
Buck	Harshbarger	Peltola
Bucshon	Hern	Pence
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Burgess	Hill	Pfleger
Burlison	Hinson	Posey
Calvert	Houchin	Radewagen
Cammack	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Carey	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Carl	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Jackson (TX)	Rose
Chavez-DeRemer	James	Rosendale
Ciscomani	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Clyde	Jordan	Scalise
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Collins	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Comer	Kaptur	Self
Crane	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Curtis	Kiley	Smith (NJ)
D'Esposito	Kim (CA)	Smucker
Davidson	Kustoff	Spartz
Davis (NC)	LaHood	Stauber
De La Cruz	LaLota	Steel
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Steil
Donalds	Langworthy	Steube
Duarte	Latta	Stewart
Duncan	LaTurner	Strong
Dunn (FL)	Lawler	Tenney
Edwards	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	Lesko	Tiffany
Emmer	Letlow	Timmons
Estes	Loudermilk	Turner
Ezell	Lucas	Valadao
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Feenstra	Luna	Van Dwyne
Ferguson	Luttrell	Van Orden
Finstad	Mace	Veasey
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Mann	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Waltz
Fleischmann	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fletcher	McCauley	Webster (FL)
Flood	McClain	Wenstrup
Foxx	McClintock	Westerman

Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym

Zinke

NOES—206

Adams
Aguilar
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españalat
Evans
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez

Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kammlager-Dove
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell

Payne
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sablan
Salinas
Sánchez
Santos
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Castro (TX)
Cleaver

Cohen
Hoyle (OR)

Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1807

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF
TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7, printed in part B of House Report 118-30 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON), on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—245

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	Massie
Alford	Scott	Mast
Allen	Fry	McCaul
Amodei	Fulcher	McClain
Armstrong	Gaetz	McClintock
Arrington	Gallagher	McCormick
Babin	Garbarino	McHenry
Bacon	Garcia, Mike	Meuser
Baird	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Balderson	Golden (ME)	Miller (OH)
Banks	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Barr	Gonzalez, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Bean (FL)	Vicente	Mills
Bentz	González-Colón	Molinaro
Bergman	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Bice	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Biggs	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Bilirakis	Gottheimer	Moore (UT)
Bishop (NC)	Granger	Moran
Boebert	Graves (LA)	Moskowitz
Bost	Graves (MO)	Moylan
Brecheen	Green (TN)	Mrvan
Buchanan	Greene (GA)	Murphy
Buck	Griffith	Nehls
Bucshon	Grothman	Newhouse
Budzinski	Guest	Nickel
Burchett	Guthrie	Norman
Burgess	Hageman	Nunn (IA)
Burlison	Harder (CA)	Obernolte
Calvert	Harris	Ogles
Cammack	Harshbarger	Owens
Caraveo	Hern	Palmer
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Pappas
Carl	Hill	Pence
Carter (GA)	Hinson	Perez
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Perry
Chavez-DeRemer	Houlahan	Pfleger
Ciscomani	Hudson	Posey
Cline	Huizenga	Radewagen
Cloud	Hunt	Reschenthaler
Clyde	Issa	Rodgers (WA)
Cole	Jackson (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Collins	James	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rose
Correa	Johnson (OH)	Rosendale
Craig	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Crane	Jordan	Roy
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Salazar
Cuellar	Kean (NJ)	Santos
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
D'Esposito	Kelly (PA)	Scholten
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Schweikert
Davis (NC)	Kiley	Scott, Austin
De La Cruz	Kim (CA)	Self
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Sherrill
Donalds	LaLota	Simpson
Duarte	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Duncan	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Latta	Smucker
Ellzey	LaTurner	Spartz
Emmer	Lawler	Stauber
Estes	Lee (FL)	Steel
Ezell	Lesko	Stefanik
Fallon	Letlow	Steil
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Steube
Ferguson	Lucas	Stewart
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Strong
Fischbach	Luna	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Mace	Tiffany
Fleischmann	Malliotakis	Timmons
Flood	Mann	Turner
Foxx	Manning	Valadao

Van Drew	Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Van Duyne	Webster (FL)	Wittman
Van Orden	Wenstrup	Womack
Vasquez	Westerman	Yakym
Wagner	Wild	Zinke
Walberg	Williams (NY)	
Waltz	Williams (TX)	

NOES—189

Adams	Gomez	Peltola
Aguilar	Green, Al (TX)	Peters
Allred	Grijalva	Pettersen
Auchincloss	Hayes	Phillips
Balint	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Barragán	Himes	Plaskett
Beatty	Horsford	Pocan
Bera	Hoyer	Porter
Beyer	Huffman	Pressley
Bishop (GA)	Ivey	Quigley
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Ramirez
Blunt Rochester	Jackson (NC)	Raskin
Bonamici	Jackson Lee	Ross
Bowman	Jacobs	Ruiz
Boyle (PA)	Jayapal	Ruppersberger
Brown	Jeffries	Ryan
Brownley	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Bush	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Carbajal	Kaptur	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Keating	Sarbanes
Carson	Khanna	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kilmer	Schiff
Casar	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Case	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Casten	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Landsman	Scott, David
Cherfilus-	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
McCormick	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Chu	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Ciilline	Lee (PA)	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Leger Fernandez	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Levin	Soto
Clyburn	Lieu	Spanberger
Connolly	Lofgren	Stansbury
Costa	Lynch	Stanton
Courtney	Magaziner	Stevens
Crockett	Matsui	Strickland
Crow	McBath	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	McClellan	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Takano
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Thanedar
DeGette	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Menendez	Titus
Deluzio	Meng	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tokuda
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Doggett	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Escobar	Moulton	Torres (NY)
Eshoo	Mullin	Trahan
Espallat	Nadler	Trone
Evans	Napolitano	Underwood
Fletcher	Neal	Vargas
Foster	Neguse	Veasey
Foushee	Norcross	Velázquez
Frankel, Lois	Norton	Wasserman
Frost	Ocasio-Cortez	Schultz
Galleo	Omar	Waters
Garamendi	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Panetta	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Pascrell	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Goldman (NY)	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—6

Castro (TX)	Cohen	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Hoyle (OR)	Lee (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1813

Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia, LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 9, printed in part B of House Report 118-30 offered

by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 163, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—268

Aderholt	Fitzgerald	Latta
Alford	Fitzpatrick	LaTurner
Allen	Fleischmann	Lawler
Allred	Fletcher	Lee (FL)
Amodei	Flood	Lesko
Armstrong	Foster	Letlow
Arrington	Fox	Loudermilk
Babin	Franklin, C.	Lucas
Bacon	Scott	Luetkemeyer
Baird	Fry	Luna
Balderson	Fulcher	Luttrell
Banks	Gaetz	Mace
Barr	Gallagher	Magaziner
Bean (FL)	Gallego	Malliotakis
Bentz	Garamendi	Mann
Bergman	Garbarino	Manning
Bice	Garcia (TX)	Massie
Biggs	Garcia, Mike	Mast
Bishop (NC)	Gimenez	McCauley
Boebert	Golden (ME)	McClain
Bost	Gonzales, Tony	McClintock
Brecheen	Gonzalez,	McCormick
Buchanan	Vicente	McHenry
Buck	González-Colón	Meuser
Bucshon	Good (VA)	Miller (IL)
Budzinski	Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)
Burchett	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Burgess	Gottheimer	Miller-Meeks
Burlison	Gramer	Mills
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Molinaro
Cammack	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Caraveo	Green (TN)	Mooney
Carey	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Carl	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Moran
Carter (TX)	Guest	Moskowitz
Chavez-DeRemer	Guthrie	Moulton
Ciscomani	Hageman	Moylan
Cline	Harder (CA)	Mrvan
Cloud	Harris	Nehls
Clyde	Harshbarger	Newhouse
Cole	Hern	Nickel
Collins	Higgins (LA)	Norcross
Comer	Hill	Norman
Correa	Hinson	Nunn (IA)
Costa	Houchin	Obernolte
Courtney	Houlahan	Ogles
Craig	Hudson	Owens
Crane	Huizenga	Palmer
Crawford	Hunt	Panetta
Crenshaw	Issa	Pappas
Cuellar	Jackson (TX)	Peltola
Curtis	James	Pence
D'Esposito	Johnson (LA)	Perez
Dauids (KS)	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Davidson	Johnson (SD)	Pfluger
Davis (NC)	Jordan	Posey
De La Cruz	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Rogers (AL)
Donalds	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (KY)
Duarte	Kelly (MS)	Rose
Duncan	Kelly (PA)	Rosendale
Dunn (FL)	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Edwards	Kildee	Roy
Ellzey	Kiley	Ryan
Emmer	Kim (CA)	Salazar
Estes	Kustoff	Santos
Ezell	LaHood	Scalise
Fallon	LaLota	Scholten
Feenstra	LaMalfa	Schrier
Ferguson	Lamborn	Schweikert
Finstad	Landsman	Scott, Austin
Fischbach	Langworthy	Self

Sessions	Steil	Wagner
Sherrill	Steube	Walberg
Simpson	Stewart	Waltz
Slotkin	Strong	Weber (TX)
Smith (MO)	Tenney	Webster (FL)
Smith (NE)	Thompson (CA)	Wenstrup
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Smucker	Tiffany	Wexton
Sorensen	Timmons	Wild
Soto	Turner	Williams (NY)
Spanberger	Valadao	Williams (TX)
Spartz	Van Drew	Wilson (SC)
Stanton	Van Duyne	Wittman
Stauber	Van Orden	Womack
Steel	Vasquez	Yakym
Stefanik	Veasey	Zinke

NOES—163

Adams	Goldman (NY)	Pascrell
Aguilar	Gomez	Payne
Auchincloss	Green, Al (TX)	Pelosi
Balint	Grijalva	Peters
Barragán	Hayes	Pettersen
Beatty	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Bera	Himes	Pingree
Beyer	Horsford	Plaskett
Bilirakis	Hoyer	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Huffman	Porter
Blumenauer	Ivey	Pressley
Blunt Rochester	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Bonamici	Jackson (NC)	Ramirez
Bowman	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Boyle (PA)	Jacobs	Ross
Brown	Jayapal	Ruiz
Brownley	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Carbajal	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Cárdenas	Keating	Sánchez
Carson	Khanna	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Casar	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Case	Kuster	Schneider
Casten	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cherfilus-	Lee (NV)	Sewell
McCormick	Lee (PA)	Sherman
Chu	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Ciilline	Levin	Stansbury
Clark (MA)	Lieu	Stevens
Clarke (NY)	Lofgren	Strickland
Clyburn	Lynch	Swalwell
Connolly	Matsui	Sykes
Crockett	McBath	Takano
Crow	McClellan	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Titus
DeGette	McGovern	Tlaib
DeLauro	Meeks	Tokuda
DeBene	Menendez	Tonko
Deluzio	Meng	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Trahan
Doggett	Morelle	Trone
Escobar	Mullin	Underwood
Eshoo	Nadler	Vargas
Espallat	Napolitano	Velázquez
Evans	Neal	Wasserman
Foushee	Neguse	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Norton	Waters
Frost	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Omar	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Pallone	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Castro (TX)	Hoyle (OR)	Murphy
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Radewagen
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Rutherford

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1817

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I was recorded as “no,” but I intended to vote “aye” on rollcall No. 170.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10, printed in part B of House Report 118-30 offered

by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—251

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lucas
Alford	Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer
Allen	Fletcher	Luna
Allred	Flood	Luttrell
Amodei	Foxx	Mace
Armstrong	Franklin, C.	Malliotakis
Arrington	Scott	Mann
Babin	Fry	Manning
Bacon	Fulcher	Massie
Baird	Gaetz	McCaul
Balderson	Gallagher	McClain
Banks	Galleo	McClintock
Barr	Garbarino	McCormick
Bean (FL)	Garcia, Mike	McHenry
Bentz	Jimenez	Meuser
Bergman	Golden (ME)	Miller (IL)
Bice	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (OH)
Biggs	Gonzalez, Vicente	Miller (WV)
Bilirakis	González-Colón	Miller-Meeks
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Mills
Boebert	Gooden (TX)	Molinaro
Bost	Gosar	Moolenaar
Brecheen	Gottheimer	Mooney
Buchanan	Granger	Moore (AL)
Buck	Graves (LA)	Moore (UT)
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Moran
Budzinski	Green (TN)	Moskowitz
Burchett	Greene (GA)	Moylan
Burgess	Griffith	Mrvan
Burlison	Grothman	Murphy
Calvert	Guest	Nehls
Cammack	Guthrie	Newhouse
Caraveo	Hageman	Norman
Carey	Harris	Nunn (IA)
Carl	Harshbarger	Oberholte
Carter (GA)	Hern	Ogles
Carter (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Chavez-DeRemer	Hill	Palmer
Ciscomani	Hinson	Panetta
Cline	Houchin	Pappas
Cloud	Hudson	Peltola
Clyde	Huizenga	Pence
Cole	Issa	Perez
Collins	Jackson (TX)	Perry
Comer	James	Pfleger
Correa	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Radewagen
Craig	Johnson (SD)	Reschenthaler
Crane	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Cuellar	Kean (NJ)	Rose
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Rosendale
D'Esposito	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Roy
Davis (NC)	Kildee	Rutherford
De La Cruz	Kiley	Salazar
DesJarlais	Kim (CA)	Santos
Diaz-Balart	Krishnamoorthi	Scalise
Donalds	Kustoff	Schrier
Duarte	LaHood	Schweikert
Duncan	LaLota	Scott, Austin
Dunn (FL)	LaMalfa	Self
Edwards	Lamborn	Sessions
Ellzey	Landsman	Simpson
Emmer	Langworthy	Smith (MO)
Estes	Latta	Smith (NE)
Ezell	LaTurner	Smith (NJ)
Fallon	Lawler	Smucker
Feenstra	Lee (FL)	Spanberger
Ferguson	Lesko	Spartz
Finstad	Letlow	Stanton
Fischbach		Stauber
Fitzgerald		Steel

Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Trone
Turner

Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyuene
Van Orden
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

ceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 223, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—210

Aderholt	Fulcher	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Gaetz	Mills
Allen	Gallagher	Moolenaar
Amodei	Garcia, Mike	Mooney
Armstrong	Jimenez	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Babin	Gonzalez, Vicente	Moran
Bacon	González-Colón	Moylan
Baird	Good (VA)	Murphy
Balderson	Gooden (TX)	Nehls
Banks	Gosar	Newhouse
Barr	Granger	Norman
Bean (FL)	Graves (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Graves (MO)	Oberholte
Bergman	Green (TN)	Ogles
Bice	Greene (GA)	Owens
Biggs	Griffith	Palmer
Bilirakis	Grothman	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Guest	Perry
Boebert	Guthrie	Pfleger
Bost	Hageman	Posey
Brecheen	Harris	Radewagen
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hinson	Rose
Burlison	Houchin	Rosendale
Calvert	Hudson	Rouzer
Cammack	Huizenga	Roy
Carey	Hunt	Rutherford
Carl	Issa	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	James	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Johnson (OH)	Self
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cloud	Jordan	Simpson
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Comer	Kiley	Spartz
Crane	Kustoff	Stauber
Crawford	LaHood	Steel
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Curtis	Lamborn	Steil
Davidson	Langworthy	Steube
De La Cruz	Latta	Stewart
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Strong
Diaz-Balart	Lee (FL)	Tenney
Donalds	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Duarte	Letlow	Tiffany
Duncan	Loudermilk	Timmons
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	Turner
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Ellzey	Luna	Van Dyuene
Emmer	Luttrell	Van Orden
Estes	Malliotakis	Wagner
Ezell	Mann	Walberg
Fallon	Massie	Waltz
Feenstra	Mast	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Finstad	McClain	Wenstrup
Fischbach	McClintock	Westerman
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Fleischmann	Flood	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Meuser	Wittman
Franklin, C.	Miller (IL)	Womack
Scott	Miller (OH)	Yakym
Fry	Miller (WV)	Zinke

NOES—223

Adams	Auchincloss	Beatty
Aguilar	Balint	Bera
Allred	Barragán	Beyer

NOES—181

Adams	Green, Al (TX)	Pelosi
Aguilar	Grijalva	Peters
Auchincloss	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Balint	Hayes	Phillips
Barragán	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Beatty	Himes	Plaskett
Bera	Horsford	Pocan
Beyer	Houlahan	Porter
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Pressley
Blumenauer	Huffman	Quigley
Blunt Rochester	Ivey	Ramirez
Bonamici	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Bowman	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Boyle (PA)	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Brown	Jacobs	Ruppersberger
Brownley	Jayapal	Ryan
Bush	Jeffries	Sablan
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Salinas
Cardenas	Kammlager-Dove	Sánchez
Carson	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Keating	Scanlon
Cartwright	Khanna	Schakowsky
Casar	Kilmer	Schiff
Case	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Casten	Kuster	Scholten
Castor (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
McCormick	Lee (NV)	Sewell
Chu	Lee (PA)	Sherman
Ciilline	Leger Fernandez	Sherrill
Clark (MA)	Levin	Slotkin
Clarke (NY)	Lieu	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Lofgren	Sorensen
Connolly	Lynch	Soto
Courtney	Magaziner	Stansbury
Crockett	Matsui	Stevens
Crow	McBath	Strickland
Dauids (KS)	McClellan	Swalwell
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Sykes
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Takano
DeGette	McGovern	Thanedar
DeLauro	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Deluzio	Meng	Titus
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tlaib
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Tokuda
Doggett	Morelle	Tonko
Escobar	Moulton	Torres (CA)
Eshoo	Mullin	Torres (NY)
Espallat	Nadler	Trahan
Evans	Napolitano	Underwood
Foster	Neal	Vargas
Foushee	Neguse	Vasquez
Frankel, Lois	Nickel	Velázquez
Frost	Norcross	Wasserman
Garamendi	Norton	Schultz
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Waters
Garcia (TX)	Omar	Watson Coleman
Garcia, Robert	Pallone	Wexton
Goldman (NY)	Pascrell	Williams (GA)
Gomez	Payne	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX)	Hoyle (OR)	Loudermilk
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Mast
Cohen	Lee (CA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1822

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 11, printed in part B of House Report 118-30 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further pro-

Bishop (GA) Himes
 Blumenauer Horsford
 Blunt Rochester Houlihan
 Bonamici Huffman
 Bowman Ivey
 Boyle (PA) Jackson (IL)
 Brown Jackson (NC)
 Brownley Jackson Lee
 Budzinski Jacobs
 Bush Jayapal
 Caraveo Jeffries
 Carbajal Johnson (GA)
 Cárdenas Joyce (OH)
 Carson Kamlager-Dove
 Carter (LA) Kaptur
 Cartwright Kean (NJ)
 Casar Keating
 Case Khanna
 Casten Kiggans (VA)
 Castor (FL) Kildee
 Cherfilus-McCormick Kim (CA)
 Chu Kim (NJ)
 Cicilline Krishnamoorthi
 Clark (MA) Kuster
 Clarke (NY) LaLota
 Clyburn Landsman
 Connolly Larsen (WA)
 Correa Larson (CT)
 Costa Lawler
 Courtney Lee (NV)
 Craig Lee (PA)
 Crockett Leger Fernandez
 Crow Levin
 Cuellar Lieu
 D'Esposito Lofgren
 Davids (KS) Lynch
 Davis (IL) Mace
 Davis (NC) Magaziner
 Dean (PA) Manning
 DeGette Matsui
 DeLauro McBath
 DelBene McClellan
 Deluzio McCollum
 DeSaulnier McGarvey
 Dingell McGovern
 Doggett Meeks
 Escobar Menendez
 Eshoo Meng
 Espallat Mfume
 Evans Molinaro
 Fitzpatrick Moore (WI)
 Fletcher Morelle
 Foster Moskowitz
 Foushee Moulton
 Frankel, Lois Mrvan
 Frost Mullin
 Gallego Nadler
 Garamendi Napolitano
 Garbarino Neal
 Garcia (IL) Neguse
 Garcia (TX) Nickel
 Garcia, Robert Norcross
 Golden (ME) Norton
 Goldman (NY) Ocasio-Cortez
 Gomez Omar
 Gottheimer Pallone
 Green, Al (TX) Panetta
 Grijalva Pappas
 Harder (CA) Pascarell
 Hayes Payne
 Higgins (NY) Pelosi

NOT VOTING—7

Castro (TX) Hoyer Lee (CA)
 Cleaver Hoyle (OR)
 Cohen Kelly (IL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1827

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania
 changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on amendment No. 12, printed in
 part B of House Report 118-30 offered
 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania
 (Mr. PERRY), on which further pro-

ceedings were postponed and on which
 the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 96, noes 336,
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—96

Aderholt Fulcher Miller (IL)
 Arrington Gaetz Miller (WV)
 Babin Gallagher Mills
 Banks Golden (ME) Mooney
 Bean (FL) Gonzalez, Vicente
 Biggs Gooden (TX) Moran
 Bishop (NC) Gosar Green (TN)
 Boebert Green (GA) Norman
 Bost Brecheen Grothman
 Burchett Guest
 Burgess Hageman
 Burlison Harris
 Cammack Harshbarger
 Cline Hern
 Cloud Higgins (LA)
 Clyde Hudson
 Comer Hunt
 Crane Jackson (TX)
 Davidson Johnson (LA)
 DesJarlais Jordan
 Donalds Joyce (OH)
 Duncan Kelly (MS)
 Ellzey LaMalfa
 Emmer Lamborn
 Ezell Lesko
 Fallon Loudermilk
 Finstad Luna
 Fischbach Luttrell
 Fitzgerald Massie
 Foxx McClintock
 Fry McCormick

NOES—336

Adams Carter (LA)
 Aguilar Carter (TX)
 Alford Cartwright
 Allen Casar
 Allred Case
 Amodei Casten
 Armstrong Castor (FL)
 Auchincloss Chavez-DeRemer
 Bacon Cherrifus-McCormick
 Baird Chu
 Balderson Cielline
 Balint Ciscomani
 Barr Fitzpatrick
 Barragán Clark (MA)
 Beatty Clarke (NY)
 Bentz Clyburn
 Bera Cole
 Bergman Collins
 Beyer Connolly
 Bice Correa
 Bilirakis Costa
 Bishop (GA) Courtney
 Blumenauer Craig
 Blunt Rochester Crawford
 Bonamici Crenshaw
 Bowman Crockett
 Boyle (PA) Crow
 Brown Cuellar
 Brownley Curtis
 Buchanan D'Esposito
 Buchson Davids (KS)
 Budzinski Davis (IL)
 Bush Davis (NC)
 Calvert De La Cruz
 Caraveo Dean (PA)
 Carbajal DeGette
 Cárdenas DeLauro
 Carey DelBene
 Carl Deluzio
 Carson DeSaulnier
 Carter (GA) Diaz-Balart

Guthrie McGarvey
 Harder (CA) McGovern
 Hayes McHenry
 Higgins (NY) Meeks
 Hill Menendez
 Himes Meng
 Hinson Meuser
 Horsford Mfume
 Houchin Miller (OH)
 Houlihan Sherrill
 Hoyer Miller-Meeks
 Huffman Molinaro
 Huizenga Moolenaar
 Issa Moore (UT)
 Ivey Moore (WI)
 Jackson (IL) Morelle
 Jackson (NC) Moskowitz
 Jackson Lee Moulton
 Jacobs Moylan
 James Mrvan
 Jayapal Mullin
 Jeffries Nadler
 Johnson (GA) Napolitano
 Johnson (OH) Neal
 Johnson (SD) Neguse
 Joyce (PA) Newhouse
 Kamlager-Dove Nickel
 Kaptur Norcross
 Kean (NJ) Norton
 Keating Nunn (IA)
 Kelly (PA) Obernolte
 Khanna Ocasio-Cortez
 Kiggans (VA) Omar
 Kildee Owens
 Kiley Pallone
 Kilmer Palmer
 Kim (CA) Panetta
 Kim (NJ) Pappas
 Krishnamoorthi Pascarell
 Kuster Payne
 Kustoff Pelosi
 LaHood Peltola
 LaLota Pence
 Landsman Peters
 Langworthy Petterson
 Larsen (WA) Pfluger
 Larson (CT) Phillips
 Latta Pingree
 LaTurner Plaskett
 Lawler Pocan
 Lee (FL) Porter
 Lee (NV) Pressley
 Lee (PA) Quigley
 Leger Fernandez Radewagen
 Loflow Ramirez
 Levin Raskin
 Lieu Rodgers (WA)
 Lofgren Rogers (AL)
 Lucas Rogers (KY)
 Luetkemeyer Rose
 Lynch Ross
 Mace Ruiz
 Magaziner Ruppertsberger
 Malliotakis Rutherford
 Mann Ryan
 Manning Sablan
 Mast Salazar
 Matsui Salinas
 McBath Sánchez
 McCaul Sarbanes
 McClain Scanlon
 McClellan Schakowsky

Schiff Schneider
 Schneider Scholten
 Schrier Schrier
 Scott (VA) Scott, Austin
 Scott, David Scott, David
 Sewell Sherman
 Sherman Sherrill
 Simpson Simpson
 Slotkin Slotkin
 Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
 Smucker Smucker
 Sorensen Sorensen
 Soto Soto
 Spanberger Spanberger
 Spartz Spartz
 Stansbury Stansbury
 Stanton Stanton
 Steel Steel
 Stefanik Stefanik
 Steil Steil
 Stevens Stevens
 Stewart Stewart
 Strickland Strickland
 Strong Strong
 Swalwell Swalwell
 Sykes Sykes
 Takano Takano
 Tenney Tenney
 Thannedar Thannedar
 Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
 Titus Titus
 Tlaib Tlaib
 Tokuda Tokuda
 Tonko Tonko
 Torres (CA) Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY) Torres (NY)
 Trahan Trahan
 Trone Trone
 Turner Turner
 Underwood Underwood
 Valadao Valadao
 Van Drew Van Drew
 Van Orden Van Orden
 Vargas Vargas
 Vasquez Vasquez
 Veasey Veasey
 Velázquez Velázquez
 Wasserman Wasserman
 Waters Waters
 Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup Wenstrup
 Westerman Westerman
 Wild Wild
 Williams (GA) Williams (GA)
 Williams (NY) Williams (NY)
 Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Wittman Wittman
 Womack Womack
 Yakym Yakym

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX) Good (VA) Lee (CA)
 Cleaver Hoyle (OR) Scalise
 Cohen Kelly (IL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and
 unable to cast my vote on seven roll call
 votes, today. Had I been present, I would
 have voted “no” on rollcall No. 167, “no” on
 rollcall No. 168, “no” on rollcall No. 169, “no”
 on rollcall No. 170, “no” on rollcall No. 171,
 “no” on rollcall No. 172, and “no” on rollcall
 No. 173.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF THE
MISSISSIPPI TORNADOES

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. The Mississippi delegation mourns those who lost their lives in the recent tornadoes that devastated our beloved State of Mississippi.

We also come together to honor the bravery and heroism of our first responders and county and city leadership, who worked tirelessly to save lives and restore order in the midst of chaos.

In Rolling Fork, Silver City, Winona, Amory, Wren, Egypt, Smithville, and all the other communities affected from the Mississippi River Delta to the north Mississippi hills, we know that the pain of loss and destruction is still fresh in your hearts.

We offer our deepest condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their loved ones. We cannot imagine the depth of your grief, but we stand with you in solidarity.

As we mourn the loss of life, we must also acknowledge the strength and resilience of our communities.

In times of disaster, we come together to support one another and rebuild. We have seen this time and time again, and we know that Mississippi will come back stronger.

In the face of such devastation, we find comfort in the words of the Bible. In Psalms 34:18, it says: "The Lord is close to the brokenhearted and saves those who are crushed in spirit."

We know that in times of trial, we can turn to God for strength and comfort. May God bless Mississippi, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, last Friday night, a lot of Mississippi was damaged by a very serious tornado. Over 20 lives were lost.

To paint a picture, these are communities that under the best of times struggle, communities where we don't have public transportation, where there is not a single motel room in the entire county, and where the downtown area no longer exists.

For the people of Rolling Fork, Silver City, Black Hawk, and a lot of other Mississippi communities that are only a ZIP Code tied to some other people, we are saddened by that destruction.

Importantly, President Biden approved record disaster approval within 2 days because destruction was clear as to the help that was needed.

The State of Mississippi and the locals involved in it, we are resilient people, but we can't do it by ourselves. Our national support system has kicked into place. Churches have stepped forward.

We look forward to the long-term recovery, and we are talking about years, not months, before those communities will be made whole again.

I thank all of you who have expressed your concern and sympathy and those of you who invested in the communities. I can assure you it is much appreciated.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Mississippi delegation, I ask for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 124, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 20221. LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 139(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "150 days" each place it appears and inserting "90 days".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 330(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "150 days" and inserting "90 days"; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking "150 days" and inserting "90 days".

(2) Section 24201(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "of 150 days".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

□ 1845

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment which inserts my 90-Day Review Act into H.R. 1. My amendment will further improve H.R. 1's overall goal of ensuring reasonable timelines and predictability for projects by shortening the timeline to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval of a major infrastructure project from 150 days to 90 days.

Frivolous litigation should not be a hurdle to critical infrastructure projects that will improve the lives of Americans across the country. For far too long, we have put trial lawyers' interests ahead of the American people. Burdensome litigation causes our hard-working men and women to sit idle on job sites as they wait on court processes.

It is far past time that Congress reduces the Federal Government's stranglehold on critical infrastructure projects and helps job creators put the American people to work.

By streamlining the Federal litigation timeline, my amendment will help reduce frivolous litigation, cut red tape, and help critical infrastructure projects move forward in a more timely manner. My amendment will reduce

the amount of time it takes to construct real and important infrastructure projects like highways, bridges, railways, dams, and other important projects that will improve the lives of the people in my district and all across America.

Last Congress, we saw Democrats ram through a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill where only 9 percent of it actually went to infrastructure. Rather than focusing on meaningful reforms, this bill funded a slush fund at the Department of Energy for Green New Deal projects; tens of billions of dollars to subsidize the electric vehicle industry, establish programs to cool down pavement, reduce idling done by trucks, and even study racist roads and bridges. Yes, Mr. Chair, you heard that correctly.

Instead of spending time on this unpopular, America last agenda, House Republicans have proposed real reforms like this one, and it would cut red tape and speed up construction. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further restrict access to the courts to hold polluters accountable when they violate the law and unlawfully harm public health and the environment.

The underlying bill already bars additional review of a permit, license, or approval under all Federal laws unless filed within 120 days. This amendment reduces judicial review times even further to 90 days for major infrastructure projects that can greatly harm communities.

By contrast, judicial review under most of our Federal environmental and public health laws is generally 5 to 6 years.

Congress included a judicial review period of this length in most of these laws because often serious public health and environmental effects aren't known within the first 120 days and certainly not within 90 days.

Judicial review is a key enforcement mechanism for most of our major environmental and public health laws. This amendment doubles down on the underlying bill's effort to gut the enforcement of our Nation's laws and to give polluters a virtual blank check.

I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Boebert amendment No. 127. One of the

main goals of the Lower Energy Costs Act is to create certainty in the Federal permitting process for those looking to invest in and build projects that will power our future.

Litigation is one of the main drivers of the uncertainty and delays associated with the NEPA process that holds back critical energy and infrastructure projects. This amendment revises the time frame within which a claimant can file a lawsuit seeking review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for a major infrastructure project, such as a highway project, from 150 to 90 days.

The purpose is to allow critical infrastructure projects to proceed more efficiently without the prolonged threat of a lawsuit that could delay or halt these essential transportation projects.

This amendment still allows a potential claimant a reasonable time frame of 3 months to file a lawsuit and does not impact environmental protections.

I support this amendment and encourage my colleagues to support its inclusion in the bill.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it is simply a public right that the public has an opportunity to seek redress in the courts. To limit that should not be part of this legislation. I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SECTION ____ . ONE FEDERAL DECISION FOR PIPELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§60144. Efficient environmental reviews and one Federal decision

“(a) EFFICIENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall apply the project development procedures, to the greatest extent feasible, described in section 139 of title 23 to any pipeline project that requires the approval of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall incorporate into agency regulations and procedures pertaining to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1) aspects of such project development procedures, or portions thereof, determined appropriate by the Secretary in a manner consistent with this section, that increase the efficiency of the review of pipeline projects.

“(3) DISCRETION.—The Secretary may choose not to incorporate into agency regulations and procedures pertaining to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1) such project development procedures that could only feasibly apply to highway projects, public transportation capital projects, and multimodal projects.

“(4) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (1) of section 139 of title 23 shall apply to pipeline projects described in paragraph (1).

“(b) ADDITIONAL CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—The Secretary shall maintain and make publicly available, including on the Internet, a database that identifies project-specific information on the use of a categorical exclusion on any pipeline project carried out under this title.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 601 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“60144. Efficient environmental reviews and one Federal decision.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to further bipartisan efforts to streamline the environmental permitting process by applying one Federal decision to certain pipeline safety actions.

Agencies such as the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration can be required to undertake lengthy and burdensome Federal environmental reviews that can take several months, and often times, even years to complete.

As a result, essential safety and energy actions are stalled or sometimes completely stopped, which can limit our energy resources, limit our ability to be energy independent, and unnecessarily create scarcities, higher prices, and threats to the safety and health of our citizens.

This amendment represents just another step toward eliminating these problems. It sets reasonable goals for reviewing the environmental impacts of certain pipeline safety actions. Specifically, it limits the review time to 2 years, consolidates Federal reviews into one streamlined process and document, and removes unnecessary delays in making final agency decisions.

This amendment builds on bipartisan support and precedent for requiring agencies to undertake one Federal decision when reviewing the potential environmental impacts of the Federal action. Similar efforts have been signed into law, including for Federal reviews of highway projects as part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act signed by President Biden in 2021.

It is recognized that through one Federal decision, we can sensibly streamline energy and energy safety projects, including pipelines, without compromising environmental protections.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to accelerate pipeline construction, and it does so by undermining informed decisionmaking and meaningful review which falls under the National Environmental Policy Act and other established bedrock laws.

We have an extensive record showing that NEPA is not a meaningful cause of energy project delays, period. When a delay does occur, it is usually because of the permit applicant who is causing the delay or because of the lack of funding for agency staff and resources at permitting offices.

While we cannot do anything about applicant delays, we have already addressed the other core issue, and we should be celebrating that. Democrats fought to get more than \$1 billion in the Inflation Reduction Act to staff up Federal agencies' permitting offices so they would be able to efficiently and effectively process permits.

The Council on Environmental Quality has also now told us that because of what Democrats delivered, even the most extensive form of environmental review will, in most cases, take 2 years or less. By the way, that was the target timeline of industry, Trump, and Senator MANCHIN.

Democrats are making quick, but high-quality reviews a reality. Republicans simply want to mandate low-quality reviews or none at all.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for his leadership on this amendment. I also want to thank Chairman WESTERMAN who has been absolutely incredible on H.R. 1, ensuring that we bring down the cost of energy, ensuring that we bring American energy security back to the table, and ensuring that we actually begin reducing emissions because we know that this administration has actually increased emissions.

What this amendment does is it actually, somewhat comically, is modeled exactly after what my friend, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, just objected to. It does exactly what he actually voted for in the infrastructure bill. That is all this does.

To hear somebody suggest that this is actually contrary to the environment is remarkable, and, in fact, it defies logic. There is study after study

that shows that by putting energy in a pipeline, by putting carbon dioxide for sequestration in a pipeline, it is safer. It is safer than the alternative of putting it on a truck, a barge, a rail where you have a better chance of leaking, and it has higher emissions.

To hear somebody object to this under the auspices of being concerned about the environment, I don't know if it is uninformed, if it is ignorant, or if it is just not telling the truth. I don't know. This amendment is a bipartisan amendment.

I am going to say it again: It is an amendment that Democrats in this body voted for months ago in the infrastructure bill. That is what this does. If you care about the environment, you should support this amendment.

Again, I thank my friend from Arkansas for his leadership.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this important amendment simply builds off existing bipartisan efforts to sensibly streamline environmental reviews by applying one Federal decision to certain pipeline projects as my friend from Louisiana indicated.

At a time when our domestic energy independence is suffering and energy prices are increasing, we must look for ways to support our energy safety, infrastructure, and production.

This amendment represents one way of doing that. It does not remove or alter environmental protections, rather it merely streamlines the process and consolidates essential government agencies and decisionmaking under one Federal decision.

To reiterate what Mr. GRAVES said, it really defies explanation that my friend from the other side would oppose this, given the fact that he just voted for it in the Infrastructure Investment Act.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. KIM of California). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. DONALDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 137, after line 2, insert the following:

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes the following:

(1) The current status of uranium deposits in the United States with respect to the amount and quality of uranium contained in such deposits.

(2) A comparison of the United States to the rest of the world with respect to the amount and quality of uranium contained in uranium deposits.

(3) Policy considerations, including potential challenges, of utilizing the uranium from the deposits described in paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. What this amendment really does is it requires a study on America's current uranium supply, specifically looking into the status of and the quality of such domestic uranium deposits, and it seeks policy solutions relating to America's domestic uranium challenges.

My amendment also requires analysis of America's supply in comparison to other countries around the globe.

In short, Madam Chair, if you are going to embrace nuclear power in the United States, we also have to understand what our uranium needs are. We have to be able to assess them, and that is what the nature of my amendment does.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) to talk about this amendment, as well.

Mr. SELF. Madam Chair, I rise in support of Representative DONALDS' amendment.

The most logical path forward for a clean, reliable electrical supply is nuclear power.

The U.S. Navy operates 80 nuclear-powered vessels with more than 5,400 reactor-years of accident-free operation.

The face of nuclear power is changing to a generation of small modular reactors that deliver power with lower initial capital costs and more flexibility in placement.

Today, we import 95 percent of our high-assay low-enriched uranium from Russia. A startling quote in a Reuters article says that, without Moscow, the U.S. nuclear power industry could collapse in 1 to 1½ years.

Today, I speak for Mr. DONALDS' amendment, which will help lead America back to total energy abundance by finding and evaluating American sources of uranium.

If you want a Green New Deal, this is it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not necessarily opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida, Mr. DONALDS, requires the Secretary to submit a report to Congress that includes the status of uranium deposits in the U.S., information on the quality of these deposits compared to the rest of the world, and policy considerations regarding the use of these deposits.

Although this amendment concerns only the making of a report, I want to take a moment to highlight the history of uranium mining in this country as it relates to our indigenous communities.

One example I will use is the Navajo Nation. From the 1940s to the 1980s, nearly 30 million tons of uranium ore were extracted from the Nation's lands, exposing generations of Tribal members to the contamination that permeated these sites.

After the mining companies were done, they simply left their operations and failed to engage in any cleanup measures.

Today, there are over 500 abandoned uranium mines on the Tribal Nation's lands, and this continues to be a serious concern for the Nation's Tribal leadership as we speak.

As you can imagine, these mines have contributed to chronic health outcomes among Tribal members and have left countless homes and water sources with elevated levels of radiation.

When we consider the status of uranium mining in this country, we must also consider the inequitable history that this industry has imposed specifically upon Tribal communities.

I hope that in addition to the information my colleague would like to be included in the amendment's report, we can also work to include a survey of the industry's historical practices and expected challenges and outcomes to local and surrounding communities.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, it is important for us to understand that there are two key investments that America is going to need to make. One is increasing our domestic uranium mining capabilities, and number two is bolstering our domestic uranium conversion and enrichment capabilities.

If the concern of the United States is to find a way to increase baseload power, and also the necessary concern about emissions, then nuclear power is the path forward for that. We have to take stock of our uranium capabilities here in the United States.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the chair of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. We have spoken about the link between hard rock minerals and national security today, but there is one resource highlighted by this amendment that must be discussed, and that is uranium.

Domestic uranium is essential for national security, given its role in nuclear deterrence and empowering the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program.

Uranium also supports the United States biomedical community because it is vital to the production of medical isotopes.

As the gentleman has pointed out, the majority of our uranium supply comes from Russia and former Soviet Bloc countries, unfortunately.

We have ample deposits of uranium here in the United States. We just have to mine it and process it, and we need to use more of it to create more nuclear power.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment. I support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, my comments about uranium mining and the reports that are requested in this amendment, I am not arguing with the request. My point is that there is a history here of impacted communities.

What do we do with waste? That challenge, the contamination, the cleanup requirements, what are the company's responsibilities? That should all be part of a survey.

If we are aggressively pursuing uranium as a source, then we need to aggressively pursue the protections, information, and intended and unintended consequences of uranium mining, of which we have a history. That is the request.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his concerns, and that is something I definitely want to work on as we move forward.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of Representative ESCOBAR, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 20103.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, when the government offers up public land for an oil and gas lease sale, the public has a right to challenge the agency's decision.

Challenges can be for any number of reasons, from concerns about air or

water, harming cultural heritage, threatening wildlife, or hurting recreational or agricultural businesses in the area.

The polluters over people act puts an arbitrary time limit on these challenges, saying that any claim must be resolved within 60 days so the agency can get on with issuing the leases.

If these challenges have merit, they should be fully considered. The arbitrary deadline shuts the American people out of the decisionmaking process.

This amendment would restore the American people's voice on how their public lands are used.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I oppose this unnecessary amendment as it would strike a provision in the bill that reinforces current law and requires the Bureau of Land Management to resolve protests to oil and gas lease sales within 60 days of payment by the winning bidder.

This amendment proposes a standard of accountability for Federal agencies that is worse than the status quo. In current practice, the BLM resolves most protests before lease sales even occur.

For example, when the BLM's New Mexico State office received formal protests for their June 30, 2022, oil and gas lease sale, BLM was able to review and respond to the protests by June 29, completing the process in 42 days and before the sale even occurred.

Once a lease is bid on and won, current law requires leases to be issued within 60 days following payment by the successful bidder.

This amendment strikes a good governance provision that does nothing more than reaffirms current law.

Just yesterday, DOI Secretary Deb Haaland testified before the House Appropriations Committee where she stated: "Energy independence is a priority to President Biden."

If energy independence is a priority to President Biden, then House Democrats should not be taking our Nation backward. Let's not undo current law that is actually working.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Energy independence, clean, renewable, safe energy, is what we are all for. This amendment continues to have the public involved in decisionmaking that affects them, their communities, and their families.

Madam Chair, I urge approval of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chair, the whole purpose of passing H.R. 1 is to make it easier to build and move America forward.

Lease awardees, under current law, are subject to extensive delays if the lease sale is protested. These delays could take weeks, months, or even years.

Meanwhile, the prices at the gas pump continue to skyrocket while we have acres of land ready to be put into production.

The current situation makes very little sense. Allowing for practically unfettered protests to lease sales with no timeline is a de facto ban on development—except this way, the administration doesn't have to admit that they actually are trying to ban American energy. It just takes a wink and a nod to the radical, wealthy, activist lawyer class that exists only to "keep it in the ground."

Working together, Interior and their friends in the protest class just drag it out, protest after protest, while American workers and families struggle to afford their daily commute.

Section 20103 of H.R. 1 resolves this problem by putting in place a common-sense timeframe that concludes 60 days after the awardee makes the payment.

Striking this section, as my colleague's amendment does, is just another attempt at slowing down any sort of oil and gas development. I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I encourage opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR.

WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 9, insert "or American farmland or any lands used for American renewable energy production" before the period at the end.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

□ 1915

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of this amendment. This amendment will prohibit the Communist Party of China

from acquiring any interest in American farmland or lands used for American renewable energy production.

China has been aggressively acquiring foreign agricultural and energy assets around the world, and the United States has not been immune to this trend. Our country's food security and energy independence are at stake, and we must take action to protect our critical resources.

In 2013, a Chinese company purchased 300 acres of farmland in North Dakota. This acquisition caused concern among farmers and policymakers in North Dakota and beyond.

This amendment directly addresses these concerns by prohibiting the Communist Party of China, or any person acting on its behalf, from acquiring any interest in American farmland or lands used for American energy production.

It is crucial that we learn from past experiences and take necessary measures to protect our domestic resources and ensure our food security and energy independence.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and join me in protecting our critical resources, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I am happy to support my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who seem to be taking an interest in supporting our homegrown, clean energy economy.

Unfortunately, there isn't much else in H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, that will help us shift to the clean energy future that we need to combat the climate crisis.

I will also say, I am significantly more concerned about foreign-owned companies buying up oil, gas, and minerals and polluting in the United States without consequence.

This amendment aligns with my efforts to increase transparency around who is operating on our lands and my efforts on raising global standards. Let's make sure we have good actors operating on our lands. We owe that much to the American people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the amendment.

Madam Chair, in recent years, there has been a concerning trend of the Chinese Communist Party purchasing farmland right here in America, including land used for farming, forestry, and other energy production.

In fact, the CCP just tried to purchase almost 400 acres of land right outside of Grand Forks Air Force Base

in North Dakota, creating a clear and present danger to our national security.

Not only does this jeopardize our national security, but takes valuable land away from our American farmers who toil day in and day out to grow crops used to feed America and provide liquid fuel options for transportation.

As a proud recipient of the Friends of the Farm Bureau award and a member of the Congressional Biofuels Caucus, I hear firsthand from our farming communities of the very real fears about the Chinese-purchased land.

If COVID taught us anything, it is that we cannot depend on adversarial nations for our supply chains, much less let them increase their hold and influence over our land.

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for offering his amendment, and I urge its support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, again, I support this amendment by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. PEREZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 22, insert "technological needs and" after "address".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment requiring permitting agencies to determine their technology needs and report them to Congress.

Like many of my colleagues across the aisle, I support permitting reforms. We can agree that existing permitting programs are onerous, saddling Americans with rules and regulations that are challenging at best to navigate.

Unfortunately, both parties share some of the blame for creating this

mess. It is Congress that has spent decades under-resourcing permitting agencies, a big cause of the backlog we are seeing today.

Congress' infrastructure investments of the last few years are critical for my district and the entire country. Simply funding projects is not enough, though. That is not the goal of recent legislation. Getting projects built is the goal.

Whether it is bridges, broadband, ports, or power lines, making sure that permits are being issued in a consistent and timely manner is key to any project's success.

I want to make clear that ensuring predictability is an important piece of the permitting puzzle, one often left out of the discussion. When someone is applying for permits, potential approval or disapproval shouldn't be at the whims of whoever is reviewing their application. Using new technology to improve consistency can help provide the certainty that businesses crave to pursue critical projects in the first place.

These reforms can't continue to help big businesses beat out our small businesses. The endless red tape involved in getting permits is a major burden for small businesses.

In sector after sector of our economy, market consolidation is squeezing America's small businesses and harming consumers. A business of five employees should be on a level playing field with a business of 5,000 employees when it comes to navigating the permitting system. Ensuring that predictability is one way permitting programs can work better for small businesses.

Right now we don't even know what resources permitting agencies need, and that is why the provision in H.R. 1 that agencies assess their staffing needs and report them to Congress is so important. My amendment simply extends that requirement to cover technology, as well.

Technology, we all know, is changing so fast right now, and giving permitting agencies better tools can help on so many fronts. New software, including programs using machine learning, can better coordinate simultaneous application reviews by agencies, it can improve agencies' communication with applicants so they can know where their permits are in the process and any additional material that may be needed for certification.

New technology can improve predictability and timely review. This is a straightforward measure that would help make the government work the way it ought to.

Congress needs to make sure that permitting agencies have the staff, technology, and resources to issue permits and expand permitting capacity.

I am proud to offer this amendment to ensure agencies' technology needs are met, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the

amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment would require the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Commerce to determine the technological needs for their respective permitting programs and report those needs to Congress annually.

The permitting process can be a significant barrier to economic development and innovation in our country, made even worse if outdated technology and bureaucratic inefficiencies are hindering the process.

While far from a total solution to our Nation's permitting woes, identifying technological deficiencies that contribute to inefficiencies could help Congress prioritize scarce resources to modernize the permitting process.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Chair, this reporting requirement is important for making sure permitting agencies work right. Making sure agencies have the technology they need will improve processes, reduce compliance costs, and speed up permitting.

The whole amendment is just 10 pages. It is a straightforward, good-government provision.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 20309, insert the following:

SEC. 20310. NATIONAL STRATEGY TO RE-SHORE MINERAL SUPPLY CHAINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense, Energy, and State, shall—

(1) identify mineral commodities that—

(A) serve a critical purpose to the national security of the United States, including with respect to military, defense, and strategic mobility applications; and

(B) are at highest risk of supply chain disruption due to the domestic or global actions of any covered entity, including price-fixing, systemic acquisition and control of global mineral resources and processing, refining,

and smelting capacity, and undercutting the fair market value of such resources; and

(2) develop a national strategy for bolstering supply chains in the United States for the mineral commodities identified under paragraph (1), including through the enactment of new national policies and the utilization of current authorities, to increase capacity and efficiency of domestic mining, refining, processing, and manufacturing of such mineral commodities.

(b) COVERED ENTITY.—In this section, the term “covered entity” means an entity that—

(1) is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of the People's Republic of China;

(2) is directly or indirectly operating on behalf of the People's Republic of China; or

(3) is owned by, directly or indirectly controlled by, or otherwise subject to the influence of the People's Republic of China.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. It is well known by now that foreign nations, China in particular, are dominating global supply chains for hardrock minerals like copper, nickel, lithium, and dozens of others.

China's overwhelming presence in the minerals marketplace is not due to an inherent advantage in mineral reserves but instead is the result of a decades-long strategy to take control of dozens of commodities, from mining to manufacturing.

For instance, China's “go global” strategy, which began in the 1990s, included \$390 billion in outbound direct investments in the mining sector.

Today, China is the primary global supplier of cobalt for batteries, despite having very limited domestic reserves, through its aggressive investment and processing capacity and foreign direct investment in mines around the world.

China also has billions invested in nickel projects in Indonesia, home to one-quarter of overall global reserves.

Nickel and cobalt are only two out of dozens of minerals that will see surging demand in the coming years. Examples of China's mineral dominance go on and on.

Just yesterday, DOI Secretary Haaland testified before the House Appropriations Committee, where she agreed that electric vehicles and renewables deepen our dependence on China. Congressman RESCHENTHALER specifically asked Secretary Haaland if electric vehicles and renewables deepen our dependence on China, and she replied yes.

We must not put China over America. We must return our Nation to energy independence. H.R. 1 combats the crisis of Chinese control of the global mineral supply chain.

My colleague's amendment is a great addition to H.R. 1. The amendment di-

rects the U.S. Geological Survey and the Departments of Defense, Energy, and State to identify the mineral supply chains needed for military, defense, and national security purposes that are at greatest risk of disruption because of China.

Once identified, the administration must develop a strategy to bring these supply chains back to the United States, including through bolstering U.S. domestic mining, refining, processing, and manufacturing.

This amendment speaks to the core of the bill under consideration today, the need to increase the domestic production of energy and minerals, a critical part of maintaining our national security.

I support this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting its inclusion in the package.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, we already have a national strategy in critical minerals. The Democratic-passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act built on the Energy Policy Act of 2020 to give agencies broad authorities to responsibly decrease reliance on China by diversifying sources, finding substitutes, and, importantly, recycling and reusing, something Republicans often ignore in favor of rushing into new mining.

This amendment puts a focus on new mining without essential protections for communities and the environment.

Many of the minerals we need for a clean energy transition in the United States are within 35 miles of Tribal land, yet neither this amendment nor the underlying bill addresses the impact of domestic mining on indigenous communities at all. It doesn't address the long-overdue need to reform the Mining Law of 1872.

We know there will be increased demand for minerals as we transition to renewable energy. That is why it is essential to reform the mining law, period.

□ 1930

We need to ensure better protections for the environment; a fair return to the American people that royalties be paid, and a seat at the table for Tribal government, as it is dictated in the government-to-government and trust responsibility that Congress holds.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and instead work on real, meaningful reform to support the clean energy transition.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which creates a national strategy for America to reshore our mineral supply chains.

Madam Chair, I want to just reiterate what the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee just said. Yesterday, the Secretary of the Interior of this Nation, who is in charge of millions of acres of Federal land, when asked on a mineral withdrawal in the biggest cooper-nickel find in the world, in northeastern Minnesota, called the Duluth Complex—which has 95 percent of this Nation's nickel reserve, almost 90 percent of the cobalt reserve, 75 percent of the platinum group metals, and a third of our copper—when the Secretary of the Interior yesterday was asked if there is critical minerals in that find, this is her answer: I don't know what kind of minerals were there. I don't think there were critical minerals.

The Secretary of the Interior has no idea that cobalt and nickel are part of the critical minerals, of the 37 critical minerals identified by the Department of Energy. This is her response.

We need a national strategy to reshore these minerals. I want to reiterate: This is offensive to my constituents who are ready and able to mine these critical minerals to secure our supply chain for this Nation. We have to secure our supply chain. We have to hold the dependency of this great Nation in the palm of our own hand, doing it with the best environmental standards and the best labor standards.

We can't allow China to dominate in our critical minerals with zero environmental standards and zero labor standards. The Communist country of China owns 15 of the 19 industrial mines in the Congo that use child slave labor, and this administration just entered into a memorandum of understanding to allow child slaves to mine the minerals that we need.

We can't do this anymore as the United States of America. We should never allow or purchase minerals mined by child slave labor. Again, this is the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America. She has no idea what is happening with the withdrawal.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, there is a strategy for critical minerals, but whatever we do going forward, the essential protections that are in place for communities, the requirement of the Tribal consultation and being at the table, that is our obligation—our constitutional obligation. Those need to be followed.

The reason they need to be followed is the energy strategy that I am hearing from the Republicans is just going back to the good old days. The good old days created these laws, these protections.

I use the example of Navajo Nation and uranium contamination. The list

can go on and on and on. If we are saying that that collateral damage, those bad health impacts, that destruction of a community, that toxic cleanup left to local taxpayers, that that is okay because that is part of the past and that is part of the mining history of the past under the 1872 law, that we should replicate that now? No.

This amendment is wrong-headed. It takes us in a different direction. It cuts the public out of the process. It violates our nation-to-nation consultation responsibility.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II of division B the following:

SEC. 20221. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITIES FROM CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Wildfire mitigation activities of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may be carried out without regard to the provisions of law specified in subsection (b).

(b) PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.—The provisions of law specified in this section are all Federal, State, or other laws, regulations, and legal requirements of, deriving from, or related to the subject of, the following laws:

(1) Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(2) The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(c) WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITY.—For purposes of this section, the term “wildfire mitigation activity” —

(1) is an activity conducted on Federal land that is—

(A) under the administration of the Director of the National Park System, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service; and

(B) within 300 feet of any permanent or temporary road, as measured from the center of such road; and

(2) includes forest thinning, hazardous fuel reduction, prescribed burning, and vegetation management.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I thank our chairman for his diligent work on H.R. 1 and the amendments that are going with it. I appreciate it.

Madam Chair, I rise today not only to support H.R. 1, that will make long overdue changes to our permitting sys-

tem and allow time-sensitive projects to be considered and approved in a reasonable timeframe, but I am also in support of two amendments that I am very pleased to see included.

The first amendment is No. 23, otherwise known as the Combustion Avoidance along Rural Roads Act, or the CARR Act. The CARR Act is named after the 2018 devastating wildfire that occurred in Redding, California, that started from a flat trailer tire igniting roadside vegetation. This fire coined the term “firenado” as it occurred there with the deadly winds that whipped that fire into what became a 230,000-acre blaze that also took eight lives.

This bill would waive time-consuming requirements under NEPA and the ESA for wildfire mitigation activities conducted within 300 feet of a roadway. These wildfire mitigation activities would include thinning, hazardous fuels reduction, prescribed burning, and vegetation management, and be overseen by the Department of the Interior or USDA, and be conducted on Federal land as administered by the National Park system, the Bureau of Land Management, or the Forest Service.

Roadways, of course, can be a higher risk area for combustion. It only makes sense to do the type of thinning and management along roadways to vastly reduce that risk. Had this been in practice already, the Carr fire likely would not have happened.

I hope we can have this kind of common sense be applied toward our roadways under the CARR Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, once again, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, which would unnecessarily waive fundamental environmental laws for wildfire mitigation activity adjacent to roads.

Madam Chair, the underlying bill we are considering today is a polluter wish list of environmental shortcuts designed to open our public lands to more and more extraction while cutting the public out of the decisionmaking process.

The bottom line is, I simply do not think that Congress should be in the business of waiving requirements outlined in the Endangered Species Act or the National Environmental Protection Act.

These laws provide critical protections that guide the management of our public lands and waters—critical protections that do not hinder efforts to mitigate wildfire risk or manage our forests.

In fact, many of the activities contemplated by the amendment are covered under existing categorical exclusions, which allow land management

agencies to carry out routine projects in a fast, efficient, and flexible manner.

I will not deny that carrying out wildfire mitigation projects across our national forest and public land is a critical priority. However, we do not have to cast aside environmental standards to get it done.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I am disappointed that this would be deemed a wish list item, indeed, when the eight lives lost and the families affected in the Redding area would look at this as something critical.

The categorical exclusions do not go far enough, obviously, or they would have been utilized in a fashion that would be making a wide enough swath around our roadways to make them safe from fire and our forests safe from fire.

Madam Chair, I urge, please, an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. The provisions of this bill, such as Representative GRAVES' BUILDER Act, would streamline the inefficient and costly NEPA process. It is costly in more than just dollars. It is costly to our environment. It is costly in human lives.

As the gentleman explained, we can do better managing our forests. When we keep these forests healthy, we are protecting human life. We are protecting property. We are also protecting the very, very thing that does more to support and help the environment than anything else, and it is our forest.

It is a tragedy that we send up so much of our forest in smoke. This NEPA process, although it is streamlining, will help to produce more domestic energy. It will also help to build infrastructure. It will help to take care of our national forest and Federal lands.

Madam Chair, this is a good amendment. I support it, and I encourage others to support it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I conclude by asking that we not have more scenes that look like this—similar to this—that happened in Redding, and that we be allowed to do the work effectively along our roadways, which are risk zones with traffic, et cetera.

Madam Chair, I ask for an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of title II of division B the following:

SEC. 20221. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, FACILITY INSPECTION, AND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE RELATING TO ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY RIGHTS OF WAY.

(a) HAZARD TREES WITHIN 50 FEET OF ELECTRIC POWER LINE.—Section 512(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(a)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "10" and inserting "50".

(b) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.—Section 512(c)(3)(E) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) consulting with private landowners with respect to any hazard trees identified for removal from land owned by such private landowners."

(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—Clause (iv) of section 512(c)(4)(A) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(iv) ensures that—

"(I) a plan submitted without a modification under clause (iii) shall be automatically approved 60 days after review; and

"(II) a plan submitted with a modification under clause (iii) shall be automatically approved 67 days after review."

SEC. 20222. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR ELECTRIC UTILITY LINES RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

(a) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Secretary concerned" means—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System lands; and

(2) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands.

(b) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ESTABLISHED.—Forest management activities described in subsection (c) are a category of activities designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESIGNATED FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The forest management activities designated as being categorically excluded under subsection (b) are—

(1) the development and approval of a vegetation management, facility inspection, and operation and maintenance plan submitted under section 512(c)(1) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1772(c)(1)) by the Secretary concerned; and

(2) the implementation of routine activities conducted under the plan referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) AVAILABILITY OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary concerned may use the categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) in accordance with this section.

(e) EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Use of the categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) shall not be subject to the extraordinary circumstances procedures in section 220.6, title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 1508.4, title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(f) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.—The categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) shall not apply to any forest management activity conducted—

(1) in a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(2) on National Forest System lands on which, by Act of Congress, the removal of vegetation is restricted or prohibited.

(g) PERMANENT ROADS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON ESTABLISHMENT.—A forest management activity designated under subsection (c) shall not include the establishment of a permanent road.

(2) EXISTING ROADS.—The Secretary concerned may carry out necessary maintenance and repair on an existing permanent road for the purposes of conducting a forest management activity designated under subsection (c).

(3) TEMPORARY ROADS.—The Secretary concerned shall decommission any temporary road constructed for a forest management activity designated under subsection (c) not later than 3 years after the date on which the action is completed.

(h) APPLICABLE LAWS.—A forest management activity designated under subsection (c) shall not be subject to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536), section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, or any other applicable law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, amendment No. 24, also known as the CLEAR Zones Act, is an enhancement of the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act. This amendment would extend the hazard zone around power lines to allow utility companies to clear trees that pose a danger to transmission infrastructure.

It also gives automatic approval of vegetation management plans after 60 days, which keeps these plans moving forward while still giving adequate time for reasonable review instead of needless delays in these critical fire risk zones.

During debate, I have heard some of my colleagues refer to this amendment and other proposals in H.R. 1 as a giveaway, in this case, to utility companies, or a trashing of the environment. That is offensively untrue. Indeed, the environment suffers much more by the massive amount of fire we are talking about.

Both of my amendments are a direct response to wildfires that have already occurred in my district. Had they been in place, largely, the Camp fire that destroyed the town of Paradise, 153,000 acres and took 85 lives, would not have happened, as a fire caught from foliage that was underneath a power line.

Also, the million-acre Dixie fire that occurred in my district from what looked like a healthy tree falling into

a power line, destroyed two towns additionally, Greenville and Canyon Dam. I was there at Canyon Dam 5 minutes before it was lost completely.

Unlike most environmental regulations, this policy is not just about potential future effects, it is also about the fires that have already happened. They have already destroyed homes, already taken lives. This is a message to those folks that your suffering was not needless.

It is about stopping these wildfires from happening again by having wise management around our power lines so that the odds of fire occurring from these power lines existing in our rural areas is reduced greatly.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, which would change existing guidelines and create a new categorical exclusion for managing vegetation along transmission lines that run across national forests and public lands.

In order to advance the renewable energy future that the underlying bill moves us away from, we do need to prioritize transmission.

That is why House Democrats worked tirelessly to invest billions in new opportunities that the Biden administration is currently delivering across America.

□ 1945

These investments are building out rural electrical infrastructure and will expand access to renewable energy to more and more Americans.

Confronting the climate crisis also means reducing risk associated with transmission infrastructure, which certainly includes wildfire. However, this amendment is a bridge too far.

There is an administrative process to establish categorical exclusions. That is the right way to get them done, not through a fly-by-night amendment on a largely unrelated piece of legislation.

The amendment also sets up unrealistic approval timelines, deeming a permit approved if an agency has not responded within 60 days. We all know that Federal land management agencies are understaffed and underresourced.

The solution is investing in the workforce and building out agency capacity, not creating unworkable timelines designed to ultimately be ignored.

This amendment, however, is not the answer.

Madam Chair, I urge a vote "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman not only for yielding me time but for bringing another commonsense and good amendment that makes H.R. 1 even a better bill.

As he mentioned, similar provisions were enacted in 2018 to allow electric transmission or distribution facility operators to remove hazard trees that can threaten infrastructure and start a catastrophic wildfire. That is what this amendment was built on.

Madam Chair, I have been to California. I have been to South Lake Tahoe. I have seen the efforts and the fruits of the labor in the field from the work of my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and our colleague Mr. MCCLINTOCK, who worked so hard to be able to get this provision in previous legislation.

This has been used to thin the timber on power lines. Actually, these provisions have helped stop wildfires from spreading. This works. This should be added to, and we should be doing it everywhere we can to prevent these catastrophic wildfires like the folks in California and other parts of the West see all too often.

Madam Chair, I support this amendment, and I encourage everyone else to support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I ask that people really stop and think about what we are asking here. This is not unreasonable where power lines interface with forested areas. Precautions like we are talking about would have directly, in these two cases, saved three towns, over 1.1 million acres, and at least 85 lives had they had the ability to thin properly around power lines. It is that basic.

As long as we are going to have electricity come from rural areas, we are going to have these needs to be able to have safety around our power lines by doing commonsense management around them.

Madam Chair, I ask Members to vote "aye" on amendment No. 24, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 20220 the following:

SEC. 20221. STAFFING PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each local unit of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service shall conduct an outreach plan for disseminating and advertising open civil service positions with functions relating to permitting or natural resources in their offices. Each such plan shall include outreach to local high schools, community colleges, institutions of higher education, and any other relevant institutions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture (as the case may be).

(b) COLLABORATION PERMITTED.—Such local units of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service located in reasonably close geographic areas may collaborate to produce a joint outreach plan that meets the requirements of subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to debate and consider my amendment to encourage local hiring and recruitment, but I also want to note my disappointment that my friends across the aisle rejected any consideration of my other two amendments on this floor.

One of those amendments would allow the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to prevent exploratory mining from taking place on Federal land if it would negatively impact our water, farmers, Tribes, or local communities.

In New Mexico, "agua es vida"; "water is life." It shouldn't be controversial to protect our waters from mining contamination for our people, farmers, and environment.

My other amendment would have simply stated that this bill would not go into effect until the Federal Government certified that it would lower costs for American consumers and save taxpayers money. If this bill is really designed to lower energy costs for American consumers and taxpayers, let's verify that before putting polluters over people.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to consider my amendment, which would require local units of the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and National Park Service to conduct an outreach plan to disseminate and advertise local civil service positions with functions relating to permitting and natural resources in their offices. Each plan must include outreach to local high schools, community colleges, institutions of higher education, and other relevant institutions.

The BLM, the Forest Service, and the National Park Service field offices, and

ranger districts and sites are stewards of our lands and waters, but they also operate within communities within which they are located, whether it is Cuba or Farmington or Roswell, New Mexico.

Adequate staffing at these offices and their headquarters, and our Federal agencies more broadly, is critical to our ability to effectively steward our natural resources and environment and move projects through the permitting process efficiently, responsibly, and with an ear tuned in to what the local communities need.

Unfortunately, we are seeing many of our agencies struggle to fill vacancies and staff up. For example, an E&E News article from last year said there are vacancy counts for all BLM State offices; the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, Idaho; the Bureau's National Operations Center in Denver; and the other directorates.

To be clear, I know BLM and other Federal agencies are working hard to address these challenges. My amendment would take another step to help address the staffing challenges by making sure local offices are communicating with the local communities about open positions.

Whether it is New Mexico Highlands University, Eastern New Mexico University, or Navajo Tech, I believe we should be taking advantage of talent in the communities where these offices are located.

To be clear, once again, we must also provide our Federal agencies with the resources and tools they need and support our Federal workforce along the way.

The investments made last Congress to increase capacity at our Federal permitting offices were a downpayment, but we need to continue to invest in agency capability.

Again, this amendment simply makes sure that our local agencies are thinking about communicating with our local talent when trying to fill those hiring challenges.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment requires local units of the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service to open job positions related to permitting or natural resources, including at local high schools, community colleges, universities, and other institutions.

Madam Chair, I just have to commend the gentlewoman's district. I was recently in the town of Hobbs, New Mexico, and I got to visit an amazing facility called CTECH that is used to

educate future workers in that area. I have seen a lot of career and technical education facilities, and this one is second to none.

It was funded by the industry in the oil and gas business. They gave back to the community and built this remarkable facility. I believe they said over 1,000 high school students per year are using this facility. These are the places that are educating these future workers, and these jobs should be advertised there.

We have heard from multiple sectors, including in the energy, mining, and renewable energy spaces, about the permitting challenges they face, and those challenges are magnified by a lack of sufficient qualified personnel in State and local land management offices.

This amendment tasks the administration with performing outreach to local schools and other institutions to help fill open positions in their local offices.

While it is far from a total solution to the permitting challenges in our country, this amendment could help improve permitting backlogs and provide employment opportunities at the local level, including in rural areas.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his visit to my district. I also invite the gentleman to the northern part because, at New Mexico Highlands University, we have an excellent forestry department where we are looking at the center of excellence. I know the gentleman's interest in forestry.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title V of division B.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, my first amendment will strike title V of division B of this bill.

Throughout this debate, I have heard my friends across the aisle argue that the bill before us today is a reasonable attempt to reform our permitting system. Unfortunately, this bill closely resembles a wish list for Big Oil and their lobbyists.

This amendment would strike one of the most egregious portions of the bill that would undo many of the reforms we made last Congress to ensure that the American people see a better return on our public lands and waters. We should all be able to agree that the American people deserve a fair deal when it comes to the use of our cherished public lands.

For far too long, our oil and gas leasing program has offered a sweetheart deal for the fossil fuel industry at the expense of taxpayers. One fossil fuel company even went so far as to outline in a press release the many benefits of extraction on public land compared to private land. Their release highlighted that leases on public lands are cheaper, last longer, and are more expansive.

While these statements may be music to the ears of those who care most about Big Oil interests, they represent a raw and an unfair deal for the American people.

Increasing the royalty rate to a fair level—that is all we are asking, a fair level—will generate billions of dollars in revenue for taxpayers. The Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office both agree and have suggested that it is good policy.

That is why, last Congress, I introduced the Restoring Community Input and Public Protections in Oil and Gas Leasing Act to protect taxpayers by eliminating noncompetitive oil and gas leasing and raising the onshore oil and gas royalty rate, rental fee, and minimum bid amount.

I am proud that the Inflation Reduction Act includes significant provisions of that bill, including eliminating noncompetitive leasing for oil and gas sales, raising annual rental rates, and increasing the minimum bid for public lands. These commonsense reforms were simply long-overdue fixes to create more balanced fiscal terms and bring Federal lands in line with what States and private landowners already charge.

Before the IRA, the fiscal terms for public lands leasing and drilling were, in some cases, over 100 years old. For decades, these outdated rates and fees allowed oil CEOs to lease public lands for pennies on the dollar and unfairly increase their profits at the expense of taxpayers.

Even after the IRA, States like Texas and Oklahoma still charge higher royalty rates on their State lands than are charged on Federal public lands.

According to Taxpayers for Common Sense, these updated fiscal terms included in the IRA will not raise prices

at the pump or consumer energy prices, but they will raise billions of dollars in additional revenue that could go toward our funding education, healthcare, and infrastructure improvements that benefit everyone, not just oil and gas companies.

□ 2000

Unfortunately, the bill before us today would also reinstate noncompetitive leasing, an indefensible practice.

The Government Accountability Office also found that 99 percent of non-competitive leases issued between 2003 and 2009 never produced oil and gas during their 10-year lease terms. The reason why these lands were not put into production is that they are leased in areas where there is virtually no likelihood of development.

At its core, noncompetitive leasing is a wasteful practice that forces the Bureau of Land Management to expend limited public agency time and resources administering leases that hardly ever generate returns for taxpayers. It encourages oil and gas companies to buy up lands they will never use to pad their portfolios and appease shareholders, contributing to the 12.3 million acres of leased public lands that these companies are currently sitting on and not using.

Instead of maintaining these commonsense reforms and protecting the interests of American taxpayers, title V of the bill before us today would undo all of these reforms and provide a gift to oil and gas interests. By rolling back these reforms, the majority is proposing policies that would only pad Big Oil's pocketbooks even further and increase our Federal deficit by \$160 million over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, even as companies like ExxonMobil and Shell are announcing record profits.

By striking this title, we can put these dollars back in the pockets of the American people and protect commonsense reforms that are finally ensuring that Federal taxpayers receive a fair return on any private profit that oil and gas companies extract from our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people and stand against our increasing national debt by supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, which would strike provisions in the bill to incentivize responsible domestic energy production, create jobs, and reduce energy costs for American families.

This amendment would preserve the higher royalty rates for oil and gas on Federal lands and waters that were

just recently raised by my colleagues across the aisle.

Democrat talking points ignore the reality of what it takes to produce energy on Federal lands, while at the same time advocating for increased royalties that will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher energy costs.

The House Natural Resources Committee held a field hearing for H.R. 1 last month where we heard directly from operators that produce on Federal, State, and private lands. Unfortunately, none of our Democrat colleagues came with us to participate in that hearing or they would have heard the facts.

It takes less than a week to obtain a drilling permit from the States of Texas or New Mexico, and it takes over 180 days to obtain a permit from the BLM. That is just one drilling permit. Operators sometimes need 30 to 50 permits and right-of-ways from a Federal agency to develop a project on Federal lands.

It is these delays and inefficiencies that demonstrate why the royalty rate should be lower on Federal lands. The simple truth is, the lower the royalty rate, the more interest there will be in energy production, the greater our Nation's energy security, and the cheaper energy process will be for all Americans. The Democrats know this.

Earlier this month, the Biden administration confirmed this fact in a leaked Bureau of Ocean Energy Management memo on Cook Inlet lease sale 258. Their own memo noted that a lower "16½ percent royalty may be more likely to facilitate expeditious and orderly development of OCS resources and potentially offer greater energy security to residents of the State of Alaska." That was from the Biden BOEM administration.

Madam Chair, because I believe in promoting American energy security and reducing our reliance on foreign adversaries for energy and mineral resources that we should be producing here in America, I oppose this amendment.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), my good friend.

The so-called Inflation Reduction Act actually inflated royalty rates to continue punishing energy developers and all downstream consumers, whether it be diesel used by farmers or gas at the pump for a family going on vacation or even just the daily commute. Therefore, Republicans in Congress again did the right thing by returning the royalty rate to the reasonable place prior to the Inflation Reduction Act.

By striking this provision, the Democrats once again want to increase the cost of energy on American families. This doesn't make sense. For one, it simply makes oil and gas more expensive and, therefore, all uses of oil and gas more expensive.

We think of gasoline and diesel, of course, but how about plastic for everyday use, ranging from eyeglasses to medical instruments or rubber tires for electric vehicles?

How about lubricants for wind turbines?

How about fertilizer?

Should we continue to drive the cost of all of these items through the roof?

It also doesn't make sense because it only punishes producers on Federal lands and waters. I have had the good fortune of being welcomed to southeast New Mexico and west Texas a handful of times to discuss these issues, and what I have learned is that it is significantly easier and cheaper to develop on private lands.

Producers will produce.

Do we want those returns from production to be realized by communities impacted by Federal land ownership at all?

This amendment was soundly defeated in committee. Let's keep energy and oil and gas applications cheap, and let's keep revenues flowing to areas impacted by Federal lands.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division B, insert the following:

TITLE VII—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CERTIFICATION

SEC. 20701. FUNDING AND STAFFING CAPACITY.

This division and the amendments made by this division shall not take effect until the Council on Environmental Quality, in consultation with affected Federal agencies, certifies that all agencies have the funding and staffing capacity to meet the new timelines for environmental review associated with this division and the amendments made by this division without reducing the quality of review.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman

from California (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chair, this amendment simply requires Federal agencies to certify that they have the staffing capacity to meet the new environmental timelines established under this bill.

According to the Government Accountability Office, the main reason for project delays at the Federal level is a lack of agency resources and staff capacity. Thankfully, we helped address this challenge by securing \$1 billion in the IRA to ensure Federal agencies have the resources and expertise to conduct efficient environmental reviews.

A trained, equipped workforce is essential to processing environmental reviews in a timely fashion in cases where there are delays. Increasing the funding and staff for Federal agencies' permitting offices and agency workforce training is already making the permitting process significantly more effective and efficient in a responsible way.

Unfortunately, instead of building on the progress we made in the Inflation Reduction Act and supporting agencies' capacity to conduct reviews by providing additional resources, H.R. 1 takes the more politically expedient but impractical approach of simply forcing agencies onto stricter timelines for reviews without providing additional resources for Federal agencies to conduct these reviews.

By instituting these strict deadlines and limiting opportunities for community input throughout this bill, I am worried that instead of leading to more efficient project reviews and approvals, H.R. 1 may actually lead to sloppier and rushed reviews. When environmental reviews are not thorough, projects often face a litany of time-consuming lawsuits and litigation.

As some may know, I used to work on clean energy projects before coming to Congress, and my own experience is that detailed environmental reviews and a thoughtful permitting process alongside early engagement with impacted communities can facilitate more efficient completion of projects and better overall outcomes.

This amendment would help support efficient reviews by requiring that the Council on Environmental Quality in consultation with affected Federal agencies certify that all agencies have the funding and staffing capacity to meet the new timelines for environmental review required under the bill.

It is common sense that we should not be instituting arbitrary timelines if agencies don't have the necessary resources to meet them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that affected agencies have the resources needed to conduct high-quality reviews, which will lead to better overall project outcomes.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, as much as I appreciate Mr. LEVIN and his real sincerity and work on the committee, on this bill, and his expertise in this area, I must oppose this amendment tonight and hope to work with him on some additional legislation in the future.

This amendment would strike all of the provisions in division B that increase domestic energy production and reduce energy costs for American families. This amendment prevents division B from going into effect until all of the Federal agencies impacted certify that they have adequate funding and staffing to meet the timelines in the bill.

In response, I ask a simple question: When has a Federal bureaucracy ever felt it has enough staff on its payroll or enough taxpayer dollars to spend in its budget?

The answer is never, at least not as long as I have been in Congress and I have talked to Federal agencies.

Even with the spending push by the Democrats in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act—they have stated several times during the debate on H.R. 1 that they have put a billion dollars out there to speed up permitting—these Federal agencies are still asking for more money and more staff, and permitting timelines are still ballooning.

Why?

Because the issue is not an issue of staffing or budget alone. The underlying statutes and the processes are broken, and they must be fixed. That is what H.R. 1 does. It addresses the underlying issues, and it will expedite permitting for all kinds of projects.

This messaging amendment would prevent meaningful reforms in the name of growing the Federal bureaucracy. For these reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I, too, appreciate Mr. LEVIN's intent, but I rise today in opposition to his amendment. Democrats tout the "historic investments" in our agencies by the so-called Inflation Reduction Act and other deficit-ballooning bills passed when they were in complete control.

Madam Chair, I don't understand. How can the agencies be so chronically understaffed after passing all those "historic investments"?

In fact, Democrats during committee markup touted these funding levels. In a nice little graphic, they had \$1 billion from the so-called IRA alone, which includes \$30 million for CEQ, \$350 million for the Steering Council, and a whopping \$625 million for other various agencies.

Madam Chair, have we completed the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line that is going on 7 years of permitting?

The answer is no.

Have we brought any new mines on line?

The answer is no.

Have we finished any water projects in California?

No.

Look at this chart behind me. This broken permitting system is the issue. It takes decades to get anything done. A mining project in my district alone is on year 20, going on year 21 of permitting and litigation.

The need here isn't to turbocharge more Federal bureaucrats in our agencies.

H.R. 1 solves this problem. Let's modernize the permitting process. Let's put time limits on litigation, limit review page numbers, and shorten timelines for America to remain competitive and lead in energy production.

H.R. 1 also allows project sponsors to conduct the review and then submit to the agency, who must give final sign-off. I repeat this. The agency must sign off.

This isn't just a Republican provision. Many Democrats who still serve in this Chamber or in the Senate have voted for that.

Fixing permitting requires real policy solutions, not just throwing money into endless pits of bureaucracy.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After section 20114, add the following:

SEC. 20115. REQUIREMENT FOR GAO REPORT ON WIND ENERGY IMPACTS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not publish a notice for a wind lease sale or hold a lease sale for wind energy development in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area, the South Atlantic Planning Area, or the Straits of Florida Planning Area (as described in the 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program (November 2016)) until the Comptroller General of the United States publishes a report on all potential adverse effects of wind energy development in such areas, including associated infrastructure and vessel traffic, on—

(1) military readiness and training activities in the Planning Areas described in this section, including activities within or related to the Eglin Test and Training Complex and the Jacksonville Range Complex;

(2) marine environment and ecology, including species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or designated as depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) in the Planning Areas described in this section; and

(3) tourism, including the economic impacts that a decrease in tourism may have on the communities adjacent to the Planning Areas described in this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, the 2020 Trump moratorium banned all energy leasing off the coast of Florida until 2032.

President Trump recognized the natural beauty, tourism attractions, and unique wildlife, as well as one-of-a-kind military training and testing offered by Florida's coast.

It goes without saying that energy development threatens all of that, especially off the coast of Florida. I thank President Trump for his declaration.

However, President Biden and Democrats in Congress undercut the Trump moratorium in the Inflation Reduction Act by allowing offshore wind development off the coast of Florida.

This threatens our economy, ecosystem, and military readiness, as well as a number of endangered species in ways that were obvious to all except Democrats who voted to force this wind development on an unwilling public.

My amendment requires the GAO to conduct a study on how wind development would impact military readiness, marine life, tourism aspects, and prohibits offering leases for wind development until the study is complete.

I have confidence that the study conducted by our government experts will show what President Trump so easily understood—that wind is bad for Florida.

My Florida Republican colleagues and I are committed to ensuring that no wind turbines will ever be placed off the coast of Florida.

We will work with our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to block funding for this kind of development, and we will repeal the section of the Inflation Reduction Act that my Democrat colleagues voted for that want to build windmills on our beaches.

These very ugly and ineffective turbines pose untold dangers to Florida's thriving marine life and our precious natural resources.

Wind turbines also threaten our Nation's military readiness by interfering with radar detection, which can result in a complete loss of detection capabilities, according to an FAA and DOD report to Congress in 2016.

In my district, turbines are harmful to an already endangered species in the

area, not to mention, there are the untold effects of turbines that will be had on the tourism economy. People travel from all around the world to our pristine beaches, not to see windmills.

I thank Chairman WESTERMAN and Whip EMMER for working with the Florida delegation on these amendments. On behalf of one of the biggest delegations in the country, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and protect Florida from Joe Biden's windmill fantasy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This amendment stops any offshore wind lease sales in the waters around Florida until the Government Accountability Office publishes a report on the impacts of wind energy development on military readiness, the marine environment, and tourism.

I find the amendment somewhat ironic in that H.R. 1, the polluters over people act, guts the National Environmental Policy Act, which is the best tool for thoroughly studying the impacts of major projects like offshore wind.

A robust NEPA process will evaluate the potential impacts of offshore wind projects on military activities, fisheries, marine life, tourism, and coastal communities.

NEPA is the tool our government should use to help identify the best places for offshore wind and how to mitigate any potential impacts.

With all due respect to the GAO, a couple-page GAO study on the potential impacts of offshore wind doesn't make up for a thorough, robust NEPA review.

We need to make sure that coastal communities have the tools that NEPA offers to weigh in on projects that may affect their coastlines and their marine resources.

Speaking of NEPA, my colleague referenced a project. According to Politico, "But look at the energy project that Republicans are citing as their poster child for the problem sheds light on where their push may or may not help speed project approvals."

"GOP lawmakers focused on delays to the Cardinal-Hickory Creek transmission line during a legislative hearing last month, blaming the NEPA process for years of delay that have stymied a 102-mile power project from Wisconsin to Iowa. Yet, Republican's proposed changes 'would not impact' the project, said Rod Pritchard, a spokespersons for the power line's developer, ITC Midwest."

H.R. 1 guts NEPA, begins dismantling it, weakens it, and cuts the public out of the process.

This amendment protects Florida and their coastline. There are other coastlines and other communities that

don't want extraction such as gas and oil.

I mentioned California and States along the Atlantic, and they should be extended. They fight every day to preserve those areas.

Madam Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I also thank her as a freshman Member for her proactive work on the committee.

Representative LUNA's amendment requires the Comptroller General to have a report on all potential adverse effects of wind energy development in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, the South Atlantic, and the Straits of Florida planning areas.

Until this report is published, the Secretary of the Interior is prohibited from publishing a notice or holding a lease sale for wind energy developments in the area.

As she stated, the report must evaluate the potential impacts of wind energy development on military readiness and training activities, on the marine environment, ecology and tourism, including the economic impacts on communities adjacent to the planning areas.

We cannot compromise our military readiness and training activities, which are crucial for national security.

By requiring a Comptroller General report, we can make informed decisions about the potential impacts of wind energy development on our national security, marine environment, and local economies.

Therefore, I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, a frustrated former Republican official who worked for the White House Council on Environmental Quality also said regarding NEPA and H.R. 1, "... we are spending 99 percent of our political capital on a set of reforms that will be of no statistically significant consequence."

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 118-30.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following:

SEC. _____ SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT SUPPLY CHAIN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) wind energy development on Federal lands and waters is a burgeoning industry in the United States;

(2) major components of wind infrastructure, including turbines, are imported in large quantities from other countries including countries that are national security threats, such as the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(3) it is in the best interest of the United States to foster and support domestic supply chains across sectors to promote American energy independence;

(4) the economic and manufacturing opportunities presented by wind turbine construction and component manufacturing should be met by American workers and materials that are sourced domestically to the greatest extent practicable; and

(5) infrastructure for wind energy development in the United States should be constructed with materials produced and manufactured in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, major components of wind infrastructure are imported from our enemies like China. We have seen how poorly President Biden has handled the energy crisis, and to make it worse, he is outsourcing our energy to foreign adversaries.

This threatens our national security, throws away American jobs, and increases our dependence on foreign energy.

Regardless of the energy source, we need to prioritize our domestic supply chain and support American energy independence.

American energy should come from America, not China—U.S. materials, U.S. jobs, U.S. energy independence.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I support this amendment. I am happy to support my colleague on the other side of the aisle who seems to be taking an interest in supporting our homegrown, clean energy economy.

Growing a wind industry with domestic supply chains will help us create family-sustaining, good union jobs, support local economies, and help fight the climate crisis.

Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I again thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding time.

I rise in support of this amendment. The renewable energy sector is a rapidly growing part of our Nation's energy mix.

We have seen positive growth in wind energy and we hope to see it evolve into a subsector of American energy exports one day.

To achieve this goal, we need to promote the development of a strong domestic supply chain for wind infrastructure.

This amendment is a constructive step in that direction and expresses the sense of Congress that we should develop our own domestic supply chains rather than import critical components from China.

This amendment aims to prioritize the development of related industries through port upgrades, cable manufacturing, and hiring of vessels and crews for wind energy operations in the United States.

By promoting domestic production and expanding our supply chain, we can create jobs, enhance our energy security, and strengthen our economy.

Representative LUNA's amendment will not only support our energy goals but also promote economic prosperity.

I support this amendment as this policy is a positive step toward the development of a strong and secure domestic supply chain for wind infrastructure. I also encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. LUNA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LEE of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mrs. KIM of California, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-19)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2023.

The situation in and in relation to South Sudan, which has been marked by activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan and the surrounding region, including widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, and obstruction of humanitarian operations, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 2023.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2023.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from, or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 2023.

CONGRATULATING NORTHWOOD PANTHERS BOYS BASKETBALL 3A CHAMPS

(Mr. YAKYM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YAKYM. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate excellence in athletics and a very special group of Hoosier young men. March in Indiana is all about basketball, and this past weekend, the NorthWood boys basketball team out of Nappanee and Wakarusa reached the heights of basketball glory by winning the 3A State title for the very first time in school history.

The Panthers took home the hardware by outlasting Guerin Catholic in a 66-63 overtime thriller, with senior guard Cade Brenner leading the scoring with 28 points.

When they cut down the nets on Saturday night, it was a fitting end to a season in which the Panthers went a near undefeated 28 and 2. Their State championship win was the result of countless hours of hard work and practice that every player put in, what they call, The Pit.

Congratulations to Coach Aaron Wolf, who was just named coach of the year, and every single Panther on being the last team standing. Thank you for making your parents, peers, and the entire Wa-Nee community proud.

God bless you and may God bless America.

TRAGEDY AT THE COVENANT SCHOOL IN NASHVILLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MCGARVEY) is recognized for one-half of the remaining time

until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGARVEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGARVEY. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as the convener of the Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order hour.

We had been planning today to talk about the different budget priorities between Democrats and Republicans. Those are the things I care about. Those are the things I care a lot about. Those are the things I came to Congress excited to address, but we can't talk about those things today, because, once again, we are seeing our children slaughtered in their schools.

Monday morning, I dropped two of my kids off at their elementary school. I actually went in and talked to their class for career day. Their teacher let them give me a hug and walk me back to the front before I got in the car, got on the plane, and came to Washington.

While I was in the air, the tragedy at the Covenant School in Nashville unfolded. It makes me absolutely sick to my stomach.

Unlike in years past, from Uvalde to Newtown, I haven't been able to hug my own kids yet since the tragedy in Nashville, but those parents in Nashville and in so many schools across this country will never be able to hug their babies again.

We should be outraged. Outraged. Three 9-year-old children were ripped apart from their families by an assault-style weapon in their school, in the place we send them to learn, to grow, to be safe, and to feel safe.

What is more outrageous than three 9-year-olds being slaughtered by an assault-style weapon in their school? It is the 13th school shooting this year—this year—in 2023. It is the 13th school shooting this year.

It would be gut wrenching and awful if it were 13 school shootings in 13 years. It is the 13th school shooting this year.

Now, thank goodness for the courage, the bravery of the National Police Department and the first responders who kept this tragedy from impacting more families, but it should have never happened in the first place.

What are we doing? What are we doing here to stop this, to protect our kids? I heard one of my colleagues from the State where this happened say on the steps of this very building, "There is nothing we can do."

I can't accept that. As a policymaker, I can't accept that. As a parent, I can't accept that. You can't say there is nothing we can do when you are willing to do nothing.

I am a person of faith. We raised our family in the church. I believe in the power of prayer, and I am glad that our thoughts and prayers are with the families in Nashville, but thoughts and prayers will never be enough. We must look at legislation and take action so that there are no more school shootings, and we don't have to comfort families who have lost their kids because they simply went to school.

There are things we can and should do. Commonsense reforms that will keep our kids and our people safe. Let's start with universal background checks. Ninety percent of the American public wants us to have universal background checks, where to buy a firearm in this country, you have to get a background check so that we know you are not in crisis or otherwise ineligible to buy a firearm.

Instead, we see extremists in the other party willing to put gun manufacturers over people. We should ban assault weapons. These are weapons of war that have no place on our streets.

Just today, on the front page of The Washington Post, there is an expose on the AR-15. It goes into the detail we have far too often sanitized about what an assault-style rifle does to the body of a person and the body of a child. It has rendered kids unrecognizable in school shootings such as in Uvalde, Texas.

There was a product in the 1980s, lawn darts, that was dangerous for kids. We banned that; but we are not willing to ban these assault-style rifles? That is because extremists right now want to put guns over kids.

Let's talk about extreme risk protection orders. Measures that would actually keep people safe by temporarily removing a firearm from someone who is in crisis. We can't talk about gun violence in this country without recognizing that 60 percent of the gun deaths in America are death by suicide. It could help other people, as well.

I have a constituent, Whitney Austin. She was a mom. She was a project manager at Fifth Third Bank. She traveled up to Cincinnati from Louisville, Kentucky, to go to work. As she was walking into the office building, she was shot 12 times as part of what ended up being a mass shooting in Cincinnati. She never considered politics or gun policy before, because Louisville, like so many places in this country, is a small place. We call it "Louisville."

She was friends with a person I went to high school with, and before she got home from the hospital, she said, "What can I do to help? I met her in her house the day she came home. Her hair was still wet from having washed the blood out of it. We worked on legislation in the Kentucky General Assembly, legislation that I introduced with a Republican colleague from a rural part of our State that would keep people safe while respecting people's rights. Instead, we see, again, a party willing to put guns over people."

Let's talk about responsible gun ownership and laws that would encourage safe storage. Look what happened a couple weeks ago in Houston. A 3-year-old shot and killed her 4-year-old sister. A couple of days before that, a 7-year-old boy in Cleveland died from a suspected accidental self-inflicted gunshot wound.

Just last month, a 3-year-old boy in Orlando and a 4-year-old boy in Nashville each shot themselves dead with guns they found. A month before that, a 6-year-old girl in Virginia accidentally shot and killed her teacher in Virginia.

These are toddlers; but we see people willing to put guns over kids. We must try to do something. Bring these measures to a vote. Bring these measures to the floor. Let us vote on them. Tell the American people that you believe in guns over kids instead of universal background checks.

We have got to do something. We have had 38 mass shootings this month alone, and so far, 130 in just the first 86 days of this year. More than 10,000 gun deaths, and we are not even out of March.

Bring this to a vote. Replace thoughts and prayers with legislation and action. Instead of legislation and action, what we are getting from extreme MAGA Republicans are slogans, not solutions.

We are hearing slogans like "Guns Make Us Safer." How can you say that when guns are now the leading cause of death for children in this country?

□ 2045

Will the measures I have mentioned end gun violence in America? No, of course not.

Will they save lives? Yes, absolutely they will, and they will make our children safer. There is no doubt about it.

Every day that we delay, every day that we continue to refuse to take action, to put guns over people and guns over kids, we will almost certainly cause unnecessary death.

I spent 10 years in the State Senate of Kentucky. During that time, I was in the minority. For 10 years, I worked to represent my constituents but always found common ground. That is what I came to Washington to do, to continue to try to find common ground.

We cannot compromise when it comes to our kids' lives. To all of my colleagues in this body, neither should you.

Today, I am just another dad in America who is sad for the parents who won't have their kids with them this Easter, sad for the parents who have lost their children to the senseless scourge of gun violence; angry, hurting, looking to Congress to act; pleading with my colleagues to bring these bills up for debate and to a vote to stop putting guns over kids.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE), my colleague.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the students, teachers, parents, and loved ones across western Pennsylvania who are still reeling from what we all thought was our worst fear come to life today.

Just days after families in Nashville went through an unimaginable hell of losing their 9-year-old children because they had the audacity to attend a school in America, we received word about an active shooter situation back home in Pittsburgh, first at Central Catholic High School, then Oakland Catholic, and eventually a dozen of our schools across Pennsylvania.

Imagine that you are a kid in Central Catholic. You have gone through the active shooter drills, and you saw the news Monday and heard about every school shooting prior. Today, you get a text that a gunman has entered your school.

You are wondering if you will be shot. Will it be your friends who are shot, your classmate, your teammate, your teacher? Can you protect them, or should you run? Do you have time to text your parents one last time?

Imagine that you are a teacher hysterically crying to the dispatcher a minute after you heard the news. You realize the lock on your door is broken, so you start building barricades with desks and chairs. You ask your students to protect themselves by whatever means possible, from the metal rod in the closet to the acid chemicals in the physics lab.

Imagine that you are a parent and receive that phone call or text. Your heart stops. Your world freezes, and your mind starts to race. Can you get to the school on time? Will you ever hug your baby again? Will they meet you at the reunification spot?

Active shooters, hoaxes, evacuations, active shooter drills—this is no way for our kids to live.

This is disgraceful, and no, to my colleagues across the aisle, this is not normal. Active shooters aren't normal. Shooting hoaxes aren't normal. The evacuations and the active shooting drills aren't normal. There is nothing about this that is normal.

Guns are the leading cause of death for children between the ages of 1 and 18—not car crashes, not illnesses or accidents. It is guns.

Tomorrow, we will send our students back to those buildings where they experienced that immense trauma and fear. We will expect them to pretend it is a normal day. We will expect them to continue to learn, perform, and be attentive in the same classrooms that they were just barricaded in.

Thankfully, unlike the students, teachers, and families in Nashville, Michigan, Uvalde, Parkland, Sandy Hook, or too many others who were gunned down to count, they won't have to cry over their classmates' bodies or see their empty chairs when they return to school because this time, it was just a hoax—not a hoax. It was a swatting of children in schools in this era of

heightened fear and vigilance around an epidemic of school and other mass shootings.

Thankfully, today, it wasn't dead children back home in Pittsburgh. It was "just" traumatized children.

It doesn't have to be this way, and it wouldn't be this way, but it is this way because Republicans care more about guns than our kids, worshippers in a church or synagogue, or shoppers in a Walmart.

Republicans want to control what books you read. They want to control what history you learn. They want to control how you identify, who you can love. They want to control our bodies.

They want to control everything except that which could prevent preventable mass deaths of children and students and worshippers and shoppers.

In the only country on Earth where this is a problem, they will not control the proliferation of guns in this country.

For those of you who say it is too political to ask that we put an end to bullet-ridden babies in body bags and traumatized kids doing active shooter drills in their elementary schools, I ask you to stop putting your politics over our children's lives.

Mr. MCGARVEY. Madam Speaker, the comments from my colleague from Pennsylvania make me think back to last spring after the Uvalde crisis. I said every policymaker in the country should have had to drop their kids off at school the day after that shooting.

It was all over the news, and we didn't know whether to show our twins, our fourth graders, what was going on. I wanted to talk to them about it and ask them if they were okay, ask them if they felt scared.

My son looked at me and said: "It's okay, Dad. We practice active shooter drills in school. We'll be ready."

No child should have to comfort their parents in that way. We should be working to protect our kids from this scourge. Instead, we see a party putting guns over our kids.

I got an email after the Nashville shooting from the dad of a friend of mine from law school. He wrote to me and said:

Thank you for such a heartfelt, meaningful comment on the Nashville school tragedy. Too bad others don't have the guts to say what you did.

I don't know if you heard from my son, but one of the three 9-year-olds who died was my granddaughter's friend and basketball teammate. Nine years old. Think about that.

This is something simply impossible for me to process, and how do you explain it to a child?

The boilerplate thoughts and prayers we still hear from those who refuse to do anything to stop the gun violence won't help my granddaughter understand why her friend had to die from a bullet.

The gun advocates are all about their constitutional right to bear arms, yet this grandfather wonders about a 9-year-old's constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, something which far too many of our children are being denied. It's just so sad.

Thank you again for saying exactly what needs to be said again, again, and again until this craziness comes to an end.

We control that, Madam Speaker. We have some say in whether this craziness comes to an end from common-sense, publicly supported reforms: universal background checks, banning assault weapons, extreme risk protection orders, making sure we have responsible gun ownership, making sure that guns are no longer the leading cause of death among our children.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TAKING DEBT SERIOUSLY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this evening, we are going to actually do a handful of things. Some of this is just sort of responding to some of the absurd conversations I have had this week.

This is my moment when I apologize to the stenographer and clerk. Much of this you will have already heard, but it bears repeating because I actually sat down with a group of congressional staff, and it was one of those sort of passing conversations where you sit down and the Republican and Democrat staff is there, and they didn't understand some of the most basic numbers of what is going on around us.

The first thing we are going to start with here—how many of you picked up a newspaper and heard anyone talk about the debt ceiling? Apparently, it is a really big deal. Fine.

Then, you hear them say things like it is default if we don't just raise it. No, that is not how it works. Default is when you do not pay back your bonds.

It is still really important. We are going to ultimately have to raise the debt ceiling.

Can we do something that is also going to be very important? Can we do it in a fashion where we message to the world debt markets that we are taking our debt seriously, that we understand the curve is unsustainable?

We are going to walk through a bunch of boards that basically show the scale of the debt that is coming. Once again, default is when you do not pay back your bonds.

We actually had a Treasury Secretary under President Obama. He and I, I remember, had this wonderful conversation when I kept correcting him, saying that is not default. He said, okay, we are going to create a new term. It is now called a "technical default," and that is when the 30 percent of government spending that is functionally borrowed every single day, we are not able to pay for that.

Fine. Call it technical default. Let's just be accurate.

The other thing that is really important, if there is anyone in Republican leadership listening out there, please hear this: 2011, the United States actually got a downgrade. Standard & Poor's lowered the United States from its AAA rating. They took us down a notch.

They did not lower our credit rating because of the debt ceiling. They lowered our credit rating because we didn't provide a credible path on managing the scale of the debt. This is 2011.

The numbers today are devastatingly more ugly, if you can sort of mix that in language.

□ 2100

Seriously, to 2011, we moved down to AA-plus. Fine. But it was because we were doing nothing about budget deficits.

I talked about this last week. Once again, I think it was yesterday, a Member of the left going: Well, they are going to get us downgraded if we just don't raise the debt ceiling.

That isn't why we were downgraded in 2011. It is because we did not demonstrate to the world markets that we want to buy—remember, we borrowed, last year, I think it was \$48,000 a second. Every second of every day, we borrowed \$48,000. Someone has to buy that debt to finance the 30 percent of our spending that we don't cover with our tax receipts.

Wouldn't the people that buy those bonds like to know we intend to pay them back?

Does just raising the borrowing limit, which is, functionally, just like you call your credit card and raise the borrowing limit, does that tell them we are going to pay them back?

What tells them we are going to pay them back is we are building a plan, saying here is how we are going to basically deal with the debt over the coming decades.

People say that we are just going to balance. Fine, I can get you to balance, but I don't think most folks have any concept of how bloody that would be.

So maybe the better way to think about it is, the size of the economy, we are going to maximize the economic growth of the economy and try to minimize the growth of debt so we stabilize what we refer to as debt-to-GDP. Great concept.

But this one, I don't know why it grates on me so much. We have people who think they are geniuses around here saying: They are going to ruin the credit rating of the United States.

The threat of the credit rating is we do not communicate to debt markets here and around the world that we are taking our debt seriously.

Once again, an oldie but a goodie. It is already out of date, but I wasn't going to kill another board and printer ink. This will hopefully make sense.

I need everyone to understand. Let's not even worry about 1965. This is last year. Seventy-one percent of all of our spending was, functionally, what we

call mandatory. Fine. It was Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, things of that nature.

But the punch line I want you all to understand is actually right here. Defense was 13 percent of our spending. The rest of domestic discretionary was 16 percent. So I have got a 13 and a 16, and I am going to show this on a couple more charts.

In 9 budget years, if you look at the CBO report from a couple weeks ago, it makes it very clear. In 9 budget years, you can get rid of this entire portion of government—all defense, all discretionary, it is gone—and the growth of this will be so big you still have got to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars, and the next year it is dramatically worse.

That is what, 2033, which isn't that long from now. But in 2034, the Social Security trust fund is gone.

Are we going to let seniors take a 23 percent cut?

Are you going to double senior poverty?

Remember, the Democrats have made it almost impossible to have an honest conversation about entitlements. You can't have a conversation about how we are going to save Social Security.

The President got behind that microphone there and made it toxic. A year's worth of our work, where we have been trying to come up with a way to save Social Security, and we have been doing it with the Senate, with Democrats, and he knifed us. That is real immoral.

So he stands there and says: I am going to protect Social Security and Medicare. I promise. We are not going to talk about it, there will be no cuts.

Everyone applauds, yes. Fine. There have never been conversations about cutting it.

For that year I was the senior Republican over Social Security in Ways and Means, not a single person ever spoke to me about cutting it. We were working on how to try to save it.

Now, those very people I had been working with run away from the issue saying, look, the President has made it toxic. The year's worth of work, all the money we spent with actuaries, everything else, it is over.

Democrats aren't serious. They are going to use it as a weapon. Fine. We walk away. Once again, we sit and let the problem fester. Every day we wait, the math gets more difficult.

Then we have the inane: Well, we will just raise taxes.

A few weeks ago, I did a presentation here on the floor where I showed what happens if you raise the caps. So the new tax cap for Social Security, I think, is what, \$160,200, you pay your FICA tax, if you are self-employed, or your employer pays half, you pay half.

Just raised it. Every dime of income above that, if you do the incremental benefits—remember, to be honest, Social Security wasn't a welfare retirement plan. It was sort of a forced savings plan. If you gave higher-income

earners the benefit, even though you made a million dollars, you pay your full Social Security tax on that, you only save about 17 percent of the shortfall. If you just pure tax, you only save about 30, 33 percent of the shortfall.

You have been lied to. If you actually dig into what was the Bernie Sanders plan, it is not just tax on all income. It is a tax on all, all income. So over here is the unearned income; over here are the stocks; over here are the businesses. Functionally, everything in society gets taxed. Here is the punch line. It still doesn't take care of everything, but it would take care of most of Social Security's shortfall.

Now, you have got another problem. Three-quarters of the future debt is actually shortfall on Medicare.

One of the frauds in the President's budget is they come back and say: We are taking care of the Medicare part A trust fund with \$660 billion over the next 10 years. Except I need you to conceptualize this. Over the next 30 years, the shortfall in Medicare is \$80-and-a-half trillion when you do the shortfall and the interest.

\$660 billion is a lot of money over 10 years, but it ain't \$80 trillion. But this place is basically a fraud; it is virtue signaling.

One more time. I need this to sink in. I don't know why this one has been so hard. Functionally, in 9 budget years, I can wipe out all of government, and you still have to borrow money. So if you get the brain trust that says: Just get rid of foreign aid, we will get rid of waste and fraud, we will get a higher tax on rich people. Fine. Maybe that is the policy. Maybe that is where we go. It doesn't take care of the problem. That is rhetoric you use in campaigns. You stand behind the microphone and pretend you have any idea what the hell is actually going on.

The math is the math, and I feel like I work in a math-free zone.

I have done this presentation before where you say: I can get rid of all defense. I still have to borrow.

But the one that seems to sink through to some people is in 9 budget years, I can get rid of every dime of government, as you know it, and just to maintain the mandatory spending, the earned benefits and some of the unearned benefits, we still have to borrow \$200 billion or \$300 billion.

Two things I should throw out, we are trying to recalculate. That was working on the previous interest rate calculations from last month, that, turn out, already look wrong. It looks like our financing of U.S. sovereign debt is going to be higher.

I am going to show you a chart here that was also based on a much higher GDP. Understand, when we were getting a 2024 outlook and 1.6 percent economic growth, that is miserable. This is a country that used to run over 3 percent decade after decade. But we have a demographic problem. We have gotten older and we don't have as many children.

The newest economic outlook: We are down to 1.2 percent. You tell me how I make the math work in a society where the policies from this administration have telegraphed to the markets that want to make investments, that want to grow the economy, that want to—the animal spirits of let's invest, let's see if we can grow, they are abandoning us.

The new projected GDP growth as of this month is, we expect over the next year, to be down to 1.2 percent GDP growth.

□ 2110

That may not mean much to anyone here. When you have a \$20 trillion economy, a percent or two is like real math, it is real money, and it multiplies on itself. Do you remember in elementary school learning about compound interest? This is like compound economics because today's base is the next year's base is the next year's base.

These differences, if they go a couple years, are just devastating. That is what we are heading for. Back to why this is so important and why I am just almost constantly angry around here. I am working on it. I am working on having a better attitude. I am still very optimistic about the future. We are Americans, and we will work this out. I do this just passionately hoping someone is listening.

This board is a couple years old. The numbers are much worse today. I was just too lazy to print up a new one. We are functionally heading toward borrowing \$114 trillion on this board. The new update is closer to \$128 trillion over the next 30 years. The reason I brought this out again was basically to say Medicare, Social Security, the shortfalls, and the financing.

This is making an assumption that we backfill Social Security in 9 years. When the trust fund is gone, we are not going to let senior poverty double. Somehow, we are going to backfill it with general funds. The President stood behind the microphone—we functionally have made it toxic to actually work on saving Social Security. It is absolutely immoral what happened, but that is the world we have been given.

Medicare—remember this is the 2-year number, I am still using it, when you add in the interest it is over \$80 trillion short. The rest of the budget actually has a positive balance. The model is actually like cash in the bank.

As we work through this you are going to see one of the punch lines. We can come together and fix Social Security. It is a little complicated. Actually, in my world, I think I came up with like 19, 20-plus little levers you would like to adjust. I am a big fan of incentives to people so that if they want to stay in the labor force they can. Things of that nature.

There are no cuts. There may be some formula where you do some redistribution of those who only work 20 quarters, but they are higher income

earners compared to those who work 40 quarters and lower income. It is geeky stuff.

If you want to hang out with me and the actuaries, it is actually fascinating. There is a path. I have actually even grown fond of the idea of the sovereign wealth fund, the sidecar. A year's worth of work, hundreds of hours with actuaries and other people is gone.

That is this side. Medicare is about healthcare costs. Are we ready to start having an adult conversation that technology can do miracles?

We can disrupt the price of healthcare and do it in a moral fashion where we make things faster, better, cheaper, and more accessible? Why is that so hard?

I know I have said this dozens of times here, but I am learning in Congress we are all so busy chasing virtue signaling and giving a speech—hopefully I can get my 3 minutes on YouTube.

There is a path—and I will end on a couple of boards. I have done hour-long presentations here of disruptions of curing people. Concept. Five percent of U.S. healthcare—excuse me, 50 percent of U.S. healthcare is 5 percent of the population. These are our brothers and sisters with chronic conditions. Stunning math.

Do you know what happens if you start curing some of the chronic conditions?

If you ever hear someone who says this: Well, the most expensive part of healthcare is those last couple weeks of life. There is a little fraud in that math. Let's see if I can work through that.

It is for the individual. It is not for the system. The system is those with chronic conditions. If you are not one of the people with multiple chronic conditions, the last couple weeks of your life probably are really expensive. You are probably in a hospital or hospice; it is heartbreaking. There are some really ethical questions when we talk about that.

That is actually not the driver of Medicare costs. Thirty-one percent of Medicare is diabetes. How many presentations have I done here saying: What can we do to help our brothers and sisters out there? Whether it be changing food support, nutrition support. Is it the types of monitors where you can track your blood glucose where you don't have to prick your skin.

Is it having an adult conversation of—and forgive me, don't make fun of me if screw this up—GLP-1 appetite inhibitors. I guess there are two or three different types of structures there on the molecules that are used to accomplish that. Many of them are actually off-patent. Could you encourage more entries into the market?

My understanding is the three big ones, there are almost that is half a dozen more entering the market. All the way down to the presentation I did

in the previous couple weeks of the phase one beginning on the stem cell trial that actually looks like a cure for type 1. If it works, you don't need anti-rejection drugs.

It just uses, as an example, because it is so prominent—I represent a Tribal community that has the second highest per capita diabetic population in the world. It is not a poor tribe.

Is it moral to actually say: Hey, it turns out curing certain diseases, taking on the healthcare costs that are the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt, isn't it really neat the fact that I could be doing some good for society?

I had done some presentations in the past showing income inequality may be most affected by health. So my brothers and sisters on the left who are screaming at us all the time: Income inequality, it is an unfair society. Okay.

What happens if I can show you the data that health, not racism, not even education—though education was big—the number one driver is probably health. Why wouldn't they join us to actually do something that is optimistic and visionary.

Let's walk through some of the realities. This is—just one more time—the same exact chart just trying to explain. My net interest on just the shortage here is \$47 trillion. This is underestimated because we are now basing it on a higher interest rate model for the future.

If I get one more person who—I want to say this carefully. A lot of the political class, a lot of the people that write about this who actually have no idea what they are saying: You have been robbed of your Social Security. That actually isn't the math.

When you have paid in and it goes into the trust fund, and the trust funds goes over and buys a special T-bill, treasury bond, and it actually in the past had a little spiff on the interest. When the Social Security over the last couple of years has started to run short, they take their little certificate and call the Treasury and say, hey, send me some cash, and the Treasury sends cash. Now, the Treasury, functionally, doesn't have enough money because we are already living on borrowed money. They go and sell another bond to backfill.

But here is a point that is important. I know this is averages, but the averages are important. The average taxpayer—and this board is now probably 2 years old. The average tax taxpayer in America over their lifetime will put in about \$625,000 in Social Security taxes. They get back about \$698,000. So it is about a \$72,000 spiff.

Now, obviously, you would have made a hell of a lot more money if you would have taken any portion of the Social Security taxes and put them in the markets and other places. Remember, we had that conversation in the early 2000s and there was an absolute war, the left, the AARP went nuts. You can't do that. You can't. Fine, we didn't do it.

You are all a lot poorer today because we didn't do it. But, hey, the unions of collectivists basically—stand up, take responsibility if you were on the left side. You fought us. Great. This is what you got.

The average American gets about \$72,000 more than they actually put into Social Security. Fine. This over here is what crushes me. I need to make sure you understand. This is a couple, not an individual. The average couple puts in around \$161,000 in Medicare taxes when you pay your FICA tax.

□ 2120

Remember, Madam Speaker, the taxes you are paying are only paying for part A, which is up around 38 to 40 percent of Medicare spending. We call it part A. That average couple put in \$161,000, and they are going to get back \$522,000.

This gap right here multiplied times 76 million of us baby boomers is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt.

How many in the political class are like me and dumb enough to stand up in front of a room and tell the truth?

It is the truth. It is math, and the math will always win. I know I have said this over and over but—I am trying not to curse. I have had a lot of coffee today.

If we are willing to actually just embrace the truth, then we can debate solutions. I am fighting around here just to get people to accept the most basic math. I feel like an idiot week after week coming up here and saying versions of the same thing when we should be having amazing debates about the solutions, but I can't get an agreement on the basic math.

This one I am just throwing out because I did it a couple of weeks ago, and I got all sorts of crap. "That is not true." It turns out the economists now have done it multiple times, and, yes, it was true.

In the Orwellian-named Inflation Reduction Act, the left actually put in all these tax credits for solar panels, cars, and batteries. Goldman Sachs actually modeled it. There is a punch line coming. It is not what CBO said, which is that it might be \$300 billion. Goldman Sachs said no. The way they read the language: \$1.2 trillion in spending.

You have the left here who complains that you guys did tax reform in 2017, and it grew the economy, shrank income inequality, raised the poor up, and grew the economy, but rich people got some—it was a couple trillion dollars. Well, goddammit—sorry—you just did a bill where you are handing out, potentially, \$1.2 trillion to a handful of the green energy supercompanies that write you checks.

Another thing I am trying to get to is the understanding of the fragility we are at.

We have been talking about that 9-year budget window where we think interest rates now have gone, on U.S. sovereign debt, just that small rise in

interest rates that we now are seeing structurally. We think the 10-year deficit right now is structurally \$3.1 trillion that year. I am just trying to help folks understand, when you are floating that scale of debt, how fragile we have become.

This is just a bit to mock the administration's budget. The current deficit held by the public is about \$25 trillion. We should always explain the difference. When you hear us talk about a \$32 trillion deficit, there are parts in there where we are actually borrowing from trust funds and those things, and then there is debt that is sold in public bonds. That is the one that gets really dicey because market movements can change those interest rates.

Debt in 10 years is basically \$44 trillion.

Do you remember, Madam Speaker, when the excitement in the administration's budget was that they are going to have \$3 trillion—actually, almost \$6 trillion in new tax hikes, several trillion in new spending—now, this is where the math got really interesting—and we are going to lower the deficit by \$3 trillion?

No. We are heading toward borrowing \$20 trillion. They were going to lower that from \$20 trillion to take \$2 trillion, \$3 trillion off that, and the left here says they are lowering the deficit.

Huh? Let's see. In 10 years, I am at \$44 trillion of borrowing. Within there, you may have, through tax hikes and a slowed-down economy—we are still working on the model of how much the economy slowed down. Those dozens and dozens of tax hikes I have shown here on the board, if every single one of them passed and every single one of them maxed out and the absolutely unrealistic numbers somehow magically became real, they might get \$3 trillion out of it.

I guess what I am saying is that it is insane we are talking about trillions.

If I am heading to a \$44 trillion deficit in 10 years, and I have the left giddy that they will have reduced it by \$3 trillion with all the tax hikes, that means there is still almost \$23 trillion of borrowing in that time.

I am not going to even make a subject for this board.

I need my brothers and sisters on the left to stop making up stories. Just as on my side, if we say, "I can balance the budget by getting rid of foreign aid and waste and fraud," no, you can't. Some of that we should do. All waste and fraud should be gone. We really should review all spending, but we can't keep lying to the American people, saying that it actually does much of anything.

Remember, every dime of foreign aid is about 12 days—actually, in the next budget, it might be only 12 days of borrowing. You have to think that through, Madam Speaker.

This is just amusing because—let's get it right. Confiscating all income over \$500,000, so if we take our country and say: "Hey, you made \$500,001, I get

that dollar. The government gets that next dollar."

Basically, the mantra here is that we don't tax rich people enough. Let's just take all their money, every dollar over \$500,000. If we take every dime from you, in the budget we are working today, Madam Speaker, you might get \$1.5 trillion in revenue—actually, "receipts" is the right term—in receipts by taking every dollar of income over \$500,000, but we are borrowing 1.7.

Taking every dollar from people over \$500,000 doesn't get you to balance in the single year, and you basically have collapsed all of the economy. There is no more economic growth. It is the rhetoric around here and the virtue signaling around here that has no basis in math. It is theater.

Let's actually do another board. The reason I pulled out these couple of boards is that conversation I had with these young staffers where I had a couple of these young Democrat staffers who really believed that if we just tax rich people a little bit more, then it takes care of everything. Maybe they should pay more, but it doesn't solve the problem. It doesn't get you anywhere close to solving the problem.

Let's take a look at this board. If I functionally took all untaxed personal and small business adjusted gross income annually earned above—so if I take every single dime of business, small businesses and wealthy Americans or higher-income Americans—and this is done in GDP, but that is the way when you start getting into these numbers. I get about 5.1 percent of the GDP in taxes. This addresses all the base taxes we have and then additional here.

My problem is, in 9 budget years, our spending is at 7.2 percent of GDP. Then 10 years after that, we are at 9.3 percent of GDP. The year after that—excuse me—this is projected deficits. Sorry, not spending, deficits. Then, the deficit in 2050 is 12.4.

Let's see. I can take every dime of small businesses and higher-income earners—over \$500,000, I can take every dime—and the budget window we are working on right now doesn't give me anything close to paying off the annual deficits, the annual borrowing.

Am I making a point here just understanding the scale and the size of the borrowing? It is mostly healthcare costs.

□ 2130

This is just almost the exact same thing, just in a different chart. Total tax revenues raised combining Federal—this one makes a point.

When my brothers and sisters on the left say, "Well, we just tax rich people more," you have got to understand, there is actually a number of frauds in that number. When we say, well, we should put them at this tax rate. Okay. Did I add in my State and local taxes also on top of that?

We tried to see what actually happens, saying, okay, we are going to re-

spect a State like California that for the high-income earners, what is it, like 13-point something, and if they have a local tax, when you do the adjustment, I can take every dime of those high-income earners—every dime—and I am still letting States have their part of the tax. I get about 4 percent of GDP. My problem is, my Social Security and Medicare is sitting at 6 percent. It still doesn't get me there.

We have done a presentation on this. There's a couple of left Senators who walk around saying, "all we have to do is tax rich people." They are taking every dime, not just income. They are taking everything from the investments, the holdings. Actually, some of them even do unrealized capital gains, which I am still trying to figure out how you tax that.

All right. Let's actually do a couple of moments of optimism. There are solutions. This one I brought here, and I am bringing again because it is getting close.

You remember the outrage here over insulin prices? They are outrageous.

The brain trust on the other side, basically their idea was, what we are going to do is we are going to take \$36 billion and give it to Big Pharma to subsidize them to buy down the price of insulin.

You are going to complain about Big Pharma and their outrageous prices on insulin, and then you are going to hand them billions of dollars?

That is the insanity.

But it is actually great politics. We are going to beat you up, but I am going to hand you billions, and you are going to write me political checks. Yay.

Does anyone else see the scam?

But there are solutions like this. This is a co-op, and I think actually they are in production this year. This is a co-op about 70-some miles from where I am standing right now, and it was insurance companies, State Medicaid systems, it was hospitals that all got together and said, hey, you realize most insulin is actually off patent, the big eight generics out there, they are off patent.

Why the hell aren't we just making it ourselves?

I have done other presentations—I will do some more in the future—about drug pricing. The solution is not a command-and-control rationing model but actually a market supply model of let's get everyone and their cousin in the manufacturing business.

The elegance of this is this is functionally a co-op. The fact they were coming online has now disrupted the insulin market. You actually see some other companies—forgive me if I got the wrong one, Johnson & Johnson, I think—crashing their price. They were coming to market at \$30 per vial, \$55 per box.

You do realize the co-op was bringing insulin prices less than the subsidized price that was going to cost taxpayers

billions of dollars. That is the absurdity around here.

Instead of doing a market solution that actually works for everyone, the left passes subsidized solutions that only certain people get the benefit from, and Big Pharma got the checks.

Did anyone here show up at their basic economics class?

Simple pitch tonight: Tell the truth about the debt ceiling and how important it is to communicate to debt markets that we are taking our debt seriously so we can maintain a stable interest rate.

You saw some of the charts of how ugly the numbers get if we spook the debt markets.

Number two, understand how devastatingly ugly our coming debt is. It is demographics. Turns out it is not Republican or Democrat. We got old. We promised lots of benefits, and we didn't set aside the money for it.

We live in a society of miracles where if we can adopt the technology, whether it be diabetes, the next generation of telehealth, or bringing in lots more competitors into the pharmaceutical markets, it doesn't have to be a dystopian, ugly future.

How do you teach a body to think—and I despise the term—outside the box?

The box needs to be burnt down. You need to think about what is moral, what grows, and what actually changes what is crushing us financially, morally, and ethically as a society.

It turns out the solution actually is almost this unified theory of good. It doesn't have to be an ugly future, if I can just get this place to think and buy a calculator.

Madam Speaker, I am going to let everyone go home, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 30, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-663. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Budget Of The United States Government For Fiscal Year 2024, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1105(a); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-508, Sec. 13112(c)(1)); (104 Stat. 1288-608) (H. Doc. No. 118-3); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EC-664. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor/Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Standards and Requirements

[FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2022-0008] (RIN: 2125-AG10) received March 2, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1844. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Expense Allowances for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1845. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Salaries, Officers and Employees for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1846. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the Vice President for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1847. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the President Pro Tempore for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1848. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the President Pro Tempore Emeritus for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1849. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Offices of the Majority and Minority Leader for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1850. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1851. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1852. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Conference Committees for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1853. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority for

fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1854. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Policy Committees for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1855. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the Chaplain for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1856. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the Secretary for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1857. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1858. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1859. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Agency Contributions and Related Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1860. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1861. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Office of Senate Legal Counsel for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1862. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Inquiries and Investigations Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1863. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, U.S. Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1864. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Secretary of the Senate Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1865. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1866. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Miscellaneous Items for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1867. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Accounts for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1868. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Senate, Official Mail Costs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1869. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Office of the Speaker for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1870. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Office of the Majority Leader for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1871. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Office of the Minority Leader for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1872. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Office of the Majority Whip for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1873. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Office of the Minority Whip for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1874. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Republican Conference for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1875. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Democratic Caucus for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1876. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Member's Representational Allowance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1877. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Allowance for Compensation of Interns in Member Offices for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1878. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Allowance for Compensation of Interns in House Leadership Offices for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1879. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Allowance for Compensation of Interns in House Standing, Special and Select Committee Offices for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1880. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Allowance for Compensation of Interns in House Appropriations Committee Offices for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1881. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Standing Committees, Special and Select for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1882. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1883. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Clerk for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1885. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1886. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Rep-

resentatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1887. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Whistleblower Ombudsman for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1888. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1889. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of General Counsel for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1890. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1891. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1892. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1893. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Salaries and Expenses of Interparliamentary Affairs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1894. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Other Authorized Employees for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1895. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, Allowances and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1896. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for House of Representatives, House of Representatives Modernization Initiatives Account for fiscal year

2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1897. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Joint Economic Committee for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1898. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Joint Committee on Taxation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1899. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, Salaries, and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1901. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Congressional Budget Office for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1902. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Architect of the Capitol, Capital Construction and Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1903. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Capitol Building for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1904. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Capitol Grounds for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1905. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, House Office Buildings for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1906. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items,

House Historic Buildings Revitalization Trust for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1907. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Senate Office Buildings for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1908. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Capitol Power Plant for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1909. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Library Buildings and Grounds for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1910. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Botanic Gardens for fiscal years 2024; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1911. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Joint Items, Capitol Visitors Center for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1912. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1913. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Copyright Office Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1914. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1915. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1916. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Government Publishing Office, Congressional Publishing for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1917. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Government Publishing Office, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1918. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Government Publishing Office, Business Operations Revolving Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1919. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Government Accountability Office, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1920. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, Congressional Office For International Leadership for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1921. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Library of Congress, John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1922. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1923. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, For National Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1924. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1925. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Youth Build for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1926. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of

Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Ex-Offender Activities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1927. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Job Corps for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1928. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Community Service Employment for Older Americans for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1929. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1930. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1931. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations, Program Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1932. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1933. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1934. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1935. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Labor-Management Standards, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1936. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1937. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Worker's Compensation Program, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1938. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Benefits, Special Benefits for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1939. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Benefits, Cost of Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1940. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1941. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Administrative Expenses, Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1942. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1943. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1944. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1945. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1946. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Departmental Management, Salaries

and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1947. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Bureau of International Labor Affairs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1948. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Veterans Employment and Training for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1949. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Federal Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1950. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, National Veteran's Employment and Training Services Institute for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1951. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, IT Modernization for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1952. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Labor, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1953. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Primary Health Care for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1954. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Health Workforce, Construction and Capital Improvement Costs for Fiscal Year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1955. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Maternal and Child Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1956. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of

Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1957. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Health Care Systems for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1958. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Rural Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1959. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Family Planning for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1960. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration Program Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1961. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Immunization and Respiratory Diseases for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1962. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, Sexually Transmitted Diseases, and Tuberculosis Prevention for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1963. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1964. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1965. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Birth Defects, Developmental Disabilities, Disabilities and Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1966. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Public Health Scientific Studies for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1967. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Environmental Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1968. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Injury Prevention and Control for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1969. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1970. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1971. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Global Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1972. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Public Health Preparedness and Response for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1973. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1974. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-Wide Activities and Program Support for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1975. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Cancer Institute for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1976. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1977. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institutes of Dental and Craniofacial Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1978. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1979. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1980. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1981. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of General Medical Science for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1982. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1983. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Eye Institute for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1984. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Environmental Health Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1985. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute on Aging for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1986. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1987. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Nursing Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1989. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1990. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute on Drug Abuse for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1991. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Mental Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1992. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of

Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Human Genome Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1993. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1994. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1995. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1996. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health John E. Fogarty International Center for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1997. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Library of Medicine for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1998. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1999. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health Office of the Director for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2000. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2001. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health Innovation Account, CURES Act for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2002. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Mental Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2003. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Substance Abuse Treatment for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2004. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Substance Abuse Prevention for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2005. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Health Surveillance and Program Support for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2006. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2007. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Payments to States for Child Support Enforcement and Family Support Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2008. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Low Income Home Energy Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2009. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Refugee and Entrant Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2010. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Adminis-

tration for Children and Families, Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2011. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Social Services Block Grant for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2012. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Children and Families Services Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2013. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Promoting Safe and Stable Families for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2014. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, The Administration for Children and Families, Payments for Foster Care and Permanency for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2015. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, Aging and Disability Services Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2016. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Maintenance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2017. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition

to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2018. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2019. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2020. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2021. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2022. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, School Improvement Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2023. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Innovation and Improvement for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2024. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, English Language Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2025. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2026. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2027. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Student Aid Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2028. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Higher Education for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2029. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2030. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2031. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Departmental Management, Program Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2032. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Departmental Management, Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2033. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Education, Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Committee for Purchase from People Who are Blind or Severely Disabled for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2035. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Corporation for National and Community Service, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2036. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Corporation for National and Community Service, Payment to the National Service Trust for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2037. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Corporation for National and Community Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2038. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2039. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2040. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2041. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, The Institute of Museum and Library Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2042. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Council on Disability for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2043. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Labor Relations Board, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2044. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Mediation Board for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2045. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2046. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Railroad Retirement Board, Dual Benefits Payments Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2047. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Departmental Offices, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2048. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2049. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2050. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Cybersecurity Enhancement Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2051. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Department-Wide Systems and Capital Investments Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2052. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Office of Inspector General, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2053. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2054. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Office of the Special Inspector

General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2055. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2056. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2057. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2058. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions, Fund Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2059. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, Taxpayer Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2060. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, Enforcement for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2061. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2062. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2063. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, White House, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2064. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Executive Residence at the White House, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2065. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Executive Residence at the White House, White House Repair and Restoration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2066. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Council of Economic Advisors, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2067. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, National Security Council and Homeland Security Council for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2068. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Office of Administration, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2069. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2070. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2071. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2072. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Federal Drug Control Programs, High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2073. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Other Federal Drug Control Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2074. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Unanticipated Needs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2075. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Information Technology Oversight and Reform for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2076. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Special Assistance to the President, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2077. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Executive Office of the President, Official Residence of the Vice President, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2078. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Supreme Court, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2079. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Supreme Court, Care of the Building and Grounds for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2080. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2081. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, US Court of International Trade, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2082. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Court of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2083. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary Court of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses, National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2084. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Court of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judiciary Services, Defender Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2085. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Court of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judiciary Activities, Fees of Jurors and Commissions for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2086. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Court of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judiciary Activities, Court Security for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2087. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Administrative Office of the US Courts, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2088. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, Federal Judiciary Center, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2089. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for The Judiciary, US Sentencing Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2090. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Resident Tuition Support for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2091. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2092. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for the DC Courts, DC Court of Appeals for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2093. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for the DC Courts, Superior Court of DC for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2094. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for the DC Courts, DC Court System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2095. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for the DC Courts, Capital Improvements for DC courthouse facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2096. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Defender Services in DC Courts for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2097. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2098. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Public Defender Service for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2099. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2100. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Judicial Commissions, Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2101. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Judicial Commissions, Judicial Nomination Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2102. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for School Improvement for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2103. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for the DC National Guard for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2104. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment for Testing and Treatment of HIV/AIDS for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2105. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for District of Columbia, Federal Payment to the DC Water and Sewer Authority for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2106. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Administrative Conference of the US for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2107. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Commodity Futures Trading Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2108. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2109. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Election Assistance Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2110. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Federal Communications Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2111. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2112. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, U.S. Federal Labor Relations Authority, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2113. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, Environmental Review Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2114. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent

Agencies, Federal Trade Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2115. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, General Services Administration, Real Property Activities, Federal Building Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2116. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, General Services Administration, General Activities, Government-Wide Policy for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2117. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, General Services Administration, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2118. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, General Services Administration, Civilian Board of Contract Appeals for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2119. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, General Services Administration, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2120. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2121. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Federal Citizen Services Fund, for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2122. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Asset Proceeds and Space Management Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2123. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Working Capital Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2124. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2125. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Merit Systems Protection Board, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2126. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, Trust Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2127. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2128. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, National Archives and Records Administration, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2129. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, National Archives and Records Administration, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2130. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, National Archives and Records Administration, Repairs and Restoration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2131. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, National Historical Publications

and Records Commission, Grants Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2132. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, National Credit Union Administration, Community Development Revolving Loan Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2133. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Office of Government Ethics for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2134. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Office of Personnel Management, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2135. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Office of Personnel Management, Office of Inspector General vehicles for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2136. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Office of Personnel Management, Office of Inspector General, Administrative Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2137. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Office of Special Counsel, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2138. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Postal Regulatory Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2139. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2140. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Securities and Exchange Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2141. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Selective Service System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2142. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2143. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Loan Modernization and Accounting System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2144. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Entrepreneurial Development Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2145. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2146. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2147. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2148. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account, Administrative Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2149. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, Small Business Administration, Disaster Loan Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2150. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, United States Postal Service, Payment to the Postal Service Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2151. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Independent Agencies, US Tax Court for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2153. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Land Acquisition for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2154. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon and CA Grant Lands for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2155. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Range Improvements for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2156. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2157. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2158. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Land Acquisition for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2159. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2160. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife Refuge Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2161. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, North American Wetlands Conservation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2162. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Neurotropic Migratory Bird Conservation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2163. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Multinational Species Conservation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2164. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, State and Tribal Wildlife Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2165. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2166. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, National Recreation and Preservation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2167. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Historic Preservation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2168. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Construction for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2169. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Land Acquisition and State Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2170. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Centennial Challenge for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2171. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, United States Geologic Service, Surveys Investigations, and Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2172. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2173. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2174. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Oil Spill Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2175. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Regulation and Technology for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2176. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2177. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Departmental Office, Office of the Secretary, Departmental Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Insular Affairs, Assistance to Territories for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2179. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Insular Affairs, Compact of Free Association for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2180. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Office of the Solicitor, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2181. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2182. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Department-Wide Programs, Wildland Fire Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2183. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Department-Wide Programs, Central Hazardous Materials for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2184. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Department-Wide Programs, Energy Community Revitalization Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2185. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2186. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration, Working Capital Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2187. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Natural Resources Revenue for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2188. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Science and Technology for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2189. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Managements for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2190. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management, Geographic Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2191. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2192. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2193. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2194. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Hazards Substance Superfund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2196. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Inland Oil Spill Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2197. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2198. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants, Environmental Information Exchange Network for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2199. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Environmental Protection Agency, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2200. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2201. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2202. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Forest and Rangeland Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2203. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, State and Private Forestry for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2204. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Forest System for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2205. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Capital Improvement and

Maintenance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2206. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, US Forest Service, Construction Projects for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2207. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Land Acquisition for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2208. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Acquisition of Lands for National Forests Special Acts for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2209. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Gifts, Donations, and Bequests for Forest and Rangeland Research for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2210. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Management of National Forest Lands for Subsistence Uses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2211. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Wildland Fire Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2212. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Institutes of Health: National Institute of Environmental Health Studies for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2213. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2214. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Capital Repair and Restoration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2215. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Executive Office of the President: Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2216. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2217. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Smithsonian Institution, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2218. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Smithsonian Institution: Facilities Capital for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2219. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Gallery of Art, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2220. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Gallery of Art, Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Operations and Maintenance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2222. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2223. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Endowment for the Arts for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2224. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Endowment for the Humanities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2225. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Commission on Fine Arts, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2226. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Commission on Fine Arts, National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2227. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2228. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, National Capital Planning Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2229. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, Presidio Trust for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2230. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, US Semiquincentennial Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2231. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agencies, World War I Centennial Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2232. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Processing Research, and Marketing, Office of the Secretary for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2233. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of the Chief Economist for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2234. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of Hearings and Appeals for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2235. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of Budget and Program Analysis for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2236. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of the Chief Information Officer for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2237. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of the Chief Financial Officer for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2238. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2239. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Executive Operations, Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2240. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2241. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Hazardous Materials Management for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2242. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2243. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Office of General Counsel for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2244. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department

of Agriculture, Office of Ethics for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2245. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2246. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2247. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2248. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2249. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2250. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Research and Education Activities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2251. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2252. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Extension Activities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2253. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Integrated Activities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2254. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2255. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, APHIS, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2256. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2257. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2258. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Funds for Strengthening Markets, Income, and Supply (Section 32) for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2259. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Payments to States and Possessions for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2260. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2261. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2262. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Office of the Under Secretary for Farm Production and Conservation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2263. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Farm Production and Conservation Business Center, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2264. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2265. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, State Mediation Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2266. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Grassroots Source Water Protection Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2267. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Risk Management Agency, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2268. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Conservation Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2269. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2270. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Watershed Rehabilitation Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2271. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2272. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2273. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Rural Housing Service, Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2274. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Rental Assistance Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2275. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2276. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Rural Housing Assistance Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2277. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Programs, Rural Community Facilities Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2278. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Business - Cooperative Service, Rural Business Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2279. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Business - Cooperative Service, Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2280. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Business - Cooperative Service, Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2281. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Business - Cooperative Service, Rural Cooperative Development Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2282. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Business - Cooperative Service, Rural Energy for America Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2283. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Utilities Service, Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2284. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Utilities Service, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2285. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Rural Utilities Service, Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2286. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Domestic Food Programs, Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2287. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Commodity Assistance Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2288. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Nutrition Programs Administration for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2289. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, Office of the Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2290. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, Office of Codex Alimentarius for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2291. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, Foreign Agricultural Service, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2292. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, Food for Peace Title II Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2293. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program Grants for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2294. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Department of Agriculture, Food Assistance and Related Programs, Commodity Credit Corporation Export (Loans) Credit Guarantee Program Account for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2295. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2296. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration, Buildings and Facilities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2297. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration, FDA Innovation Account, Cures Act for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2298. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2299. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Capital Investment Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2300. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2301. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2302. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Representative Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2303. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Protection of Foreign Missions and Officials for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2304. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2305. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2306. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Repatriations Loans Program Account, Direct Loans for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2307. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Repatriations Loans Program Account, Subsidize Gross Obligations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2308. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2309. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, International Center, Washington, District of Columbia for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2310. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Organizations, Contributions to International Organizations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2311. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Organizations, Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2312. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Commissions, Construction for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2313. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Commissions, American Sections, International Commissions for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2314. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Commissions, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2315. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Commissions, International Fisheries Commissions for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2316. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Agency for Global Media International Broadcasting Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2317. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for US Agency for Global Media, Broadcasting Capital Improvements for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2318. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, The Asia Foundation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2319. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, US Institute of Peace for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2320. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, Center for Middle Eastern-Western Dialogue Trust Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2321. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Pro-

grams, Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2322. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, Israeli Arab Scholarship Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2323. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, East-West Center for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2324. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Related Programs, National Endowment for Democracy for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2325. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2326. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the US Commission on International Religious Freedom, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2327. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2328. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2329. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2330. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission, Salaries and Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2331. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Agency for International Development, Operating Expenses for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2332. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Agency for

International Development, Capital Investment Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2333. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of the Inspector General for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2334. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Global Health Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2335. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Global Health Programs, HIV/AIDS for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2336. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Development Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2337. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, International Disaster Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2338. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Transition Initiatives for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2339. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Complex Crises Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2340. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Development Credit Authority for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2341. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2342. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Democracy Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2343. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Eco-

nomics Assistance, Assistance for Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2344. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, Migration and Refugee Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2345. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Bilateral Economic Assistance, Department of State, US Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2346. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2347. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Millennium Challenge Corporation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2348. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the Inter-American Foundation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2349. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for the United States African Development Foundation for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2350. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of Treasury, International Affairs Technical Assistance for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2351. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2352. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2353. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Department of State, Peacekeeping Operations for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2354. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for International

Military Education and Training for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2355. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Foreign Military Financing Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2356. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for International Organizations and Programs for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2357. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Global Environment Facility for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2358. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the Clean Technology Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2359. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2360. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the International Development Association for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2361. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the Asian Development Fund for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2362. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the African Development Bank for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2363. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. ROY, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2364. A bill to provide for a limitation on availability of funds for Global Agriculture and Food Security Program for fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 2365. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a

national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. FRY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2366. A bill to establish a 90-day limit to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval for a highway or public transportation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. MACE, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2367. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program for projects for commercial motor vehicle parking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 2368. A bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2369. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to in vitro clinical tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILD, Mr. CARSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MFUME, Ms. KAMLAGERDOVE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. LIEU, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. CHU, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. BROWN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2370. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities to develop and implement a comprehensive program to promote student access to defibrillation in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PA-

NETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 2371. A bill to ensure that older adults and individuals with disabilities are prepared for disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2372. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to the People's Republic of China if the People's Liberation Army initiates a military invasion of Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 2373. A bill to reinstate certain laws relating to minimum tonnage of agricultural commodities and products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself,

Mr. CASAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 2374. A bill to reform the process for enforcing the immigration laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide for a uniform 60-day period for Congress to review laws of the District of Columbia before such laws may take effect, to permit Congress to use the authorities and procedures available under such Act for the consideration and enactment of resolutions of disapproval of laws of the District of Columbia to disapprove specific provisions of such laws, to clarify the expedited procedures available under such Act for the consideration of such resolutions of disapproval, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STANSBURY, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 2376. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and title 5 of the United States Code to facilitate participation in Federal benefits programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the accuracy of market-based Medicare payment for clinical diagnostic laboratory services, to reduce administrative burdens in the collection of data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2378. A bill to provide increased financial assistance for farmers markets and farmers market nutrition programs, to increase local agricultural production through food bank in-house production and local farmer contracting; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 2379. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the "Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr.

DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. FRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 2380. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 2381. A bill to nullify the termination of the Fulbright exchange program with regard to China and Hong Kong with respect to future exchanges for participants traveling both from and to China or Hong Kong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate September 11 Day of Remembrance as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. MACE (for herself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 2383. A bill to prohibit Federal officers and employees from engaging in any financial trading activity while on Federal Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. MOONEY):

H.R. 2384. A bill to lower energy costs by ending judicial review for legacy projects and providing jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to extend and permanently authorize the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to improve assistance to community wood facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2387. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHOLTEN (for herself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase civil penalties related to child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. COSTA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. BUSH, Ms. ROSS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2390. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to temporarily prohibit the transfer of a firearm to, or the possession of a firearm by, a person convicted of a misdemeanor in which a firearm was used, carried, or possessed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 2392. A bill to require a seven-day waiting period before the receipt of a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. CISCOMANI, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2393. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a strategy to combat the efforts of transnational criminal organizations to recruit individuals in the United States via social media platforms and other online services and assess their use of such platforms and services for illicit activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BACON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 2394. A bill to protect airline crew members, security screening personnel, and passengers by banning abusive passengers from commercial aircraft flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum salary threshold for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees exempt from Federal overtime compensation requirements, and automatically update such threshold each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to monitor social media platforms for indicators of a bank run or financial panic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H.R. 2397. A bill to clarify that eligibility of certain mortgages with Federal credit enhancement may not be conditioned on the status of a mortgagor as a DACA recipient if all other eligibility criteria are satisfied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit smoking on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Res. 264. A resolution expressing support for the goals of Workplace Eye Wellness Month by promoting the importance of protecting the eyes from increased screen time; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 265. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Rise Up for LGBTQI+

Youth in Schools Initiative, a call to action to communities across the country to demand equal educational opportunity, basic civil rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students, particularly LGBTQI+ young people, in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PANETTA introduced A bill (H.R. 2399) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Thomas H. Griffin for acts of valor as a member of the Army during the Vietnam War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1870.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1871.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1873.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1874.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1876.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1877.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1878.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 1879.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2019.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2020.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2021.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2022.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2023.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2024.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2025.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2026.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2027.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2079.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2081.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2084

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2086.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2199.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2200.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2201.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2202.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2203.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2204.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2205.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 2206.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2207.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2208.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 2238.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2259.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2260.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2261.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 2262.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 2263.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2264.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2265.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2266.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2267.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item

By Mr. BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 2268.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2289.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2290.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2291
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2292
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2293.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2294.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2295.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2296.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item

By Mr BIGGS:

H.R. 2297.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

By Mr BIGGS:

By Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2298.
Congress has the power to enact this legis-
lation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-
tionary spending item.

The single subject of this legislation is:
The single subject of this bill is providing
for a limitation on funding for a discre-

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is providing for a limitation on funding for a discretionary spending item.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill requires HHS to create a national plan at the federal level to prevent and cure Parkinson's disease.

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 2366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill simply shortens the timetable to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval of a major infrastructure project, such as a highway or public transit project, from 150 days to 90 days.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 2367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commercial Vehicle Parking

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 2368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 provides, "No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency.

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.R. 2369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK:

H.R. 2370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

Automated External Defibrillators

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that older adults and individuals with disabilities are included in disaster preparedness.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Sanctions

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 2373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reinstate certain laws relating to minimum tonnage of agricultural commodities and products, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 2374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill makes changes to immigration enforcement, including ending mandatory detention in certain cases.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution provides Congress with the exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improves DC Home Rule

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article 1 Sections 1 and 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amendments to the Indian Health Care Improvement Act

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 2377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is: healthcare

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, To regulate Commerce

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commerce

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 2379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Renaming the St. Charles East Side Station Post Office

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 2380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation pertains to state and federal prison facilities' use of cellphone jamming technology.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As written in Article I, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill restores Fulbright exchanges with China and Hong Kong.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 2382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8 OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The single subject of this legislation is:

LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 2383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Seeks to ban certain federal employees from engaging in financial trading activities while on federal property or using government resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 2384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy Permitting

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

agriculture

By Ms. PEREZ:

H.R. 2386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Forestry

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 2387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Conservation

By Ms. SCHOLTEN:

H.R. 2388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:
Child Labor Violations

By Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 2389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

The single subject of this legislation is:

Increasing the number of residency positions eligible for graduate medical education payments under Medicare for qualifying hospitals.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 2390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 2391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To temporarily prohibit the transfer of a firearm to, or the possession of a firearm by, a person convicted of a misdemeanor in which a firearm was used, carried, or possessed.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 2392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require a seven-day waiting period before the receipt of a firearm.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 2393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill establishes and implements a national strategy to combat illicit recruitment activity by transnational criminal organizations on social media and online platforms.

By Mr. SWALWELL:

H.R. 2394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Creates a banned fliers list through the Transportation Security Administrative to limit individuals who physically or sexually assault members of in-flight crew.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

0The intent behind the legislation is to increase the overtime salary threshold.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 2396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Bank Regulation

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill prohibits federal mortgage providers from limiting insurance eligibility on the basis of the mortgagor's participation in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 2398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veterans Health

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 14

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medal of Honor upgrade.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 51: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 79: Mr. POSEY and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 82: Mr. BANKS and Mr. CASAR.

H.R. 345: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 396: Mr. BEYER and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 427: Mr. OGLES and Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 496: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 506: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 533: Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 594: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 595: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 625: Mrs. MCCLELLAN.

H.R. 645: Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 676: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 698: Mrs. MCCLELLAN.

H.R. 706: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 800: Mr. STRONG, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 807: Mr. SABLON.

H.R. 854: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 906: Mr. GIMENEZ, Mrs. LUNA, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 936: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 940: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 963: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 987: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. González-Colón, and Ms. MACE.

H.R. 1132: Ms. WILD and Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1146: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1230: Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 1255: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1271: Mr. BOST and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 1273: Ms. NORTON, Mr. VASQUEZ, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1277: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1299: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1318: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 1325: Mr. TRONE and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1351: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 1388: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOLINARO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1450: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 1468: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1482: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1484: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

H.R. 1499: Ms. CHU, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1503: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1582: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1591: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1602: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 1617: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, Mr. BACON, Ms. WILD, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1624: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1627: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1640: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BICE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSENDALE, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 1654: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1685: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER.

H.R. 1698: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 1699: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BALINT, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1713: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1715: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 1742: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1750: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1753: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. DUNN of Florida.

H.R. 1758: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

H.R. 1774: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1777: Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. MANNING, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1803: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1809: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 1834: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1837: Mr. YAKYM and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. IVEY.

H. J. Res. 31: Mr. BURLISON.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 33: Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 41: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H. Res. 81: Ms. WILD and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H. Res. 108: Mrs. STEEL.

H. Res. 219: Ms. TITUS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2023

No. 57

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are our mighty fortress. Lord, You have done wonderful deeds in our Nation's history. When we have cried to You in seasons of distress, You have answered us. Though our faith is sometimes small, inspire us to speak to our mountains until they move. We thank You for Your promise in Philippians 4:13, that we can do all things because of Your strength. Today, strengthen our lawmakers, granting them courage and wisdom for the living of these days. And Lord, we thank You for the heroism of the Nashville police.

We pray in Your awesome Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 316, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 316) to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 15, to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

S. 316

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 4,487—4,487. That is the number of American servicemembers who perished in Iraq by the time the last combat troops departed in 2011, over a decade ago. Joining them are over 32,000 American servicemembers and civilians wounded in action and tens of thousands more who

struggled—many to this very day—with everything from toxic burn pit exposure to PTSD.

It is with these brave servicemembers and civilians in mind and their families and all who have been impacted by the war in Iraq that the Senate, today, votes to repeal the Iraq authorizations for use of military force from 2002 and 1991. The United States and Iraq—the entire world—have changed dramatically since 2002, and it is time the laws on the books caught up with those changes.

These AUMFs have outlived their use. These repeals will not harm our servicemembers abroad nor will they hinder our ability to keep Americans safe. Every year we keep these AUMFs on the books is another chance for a future administration to abuse them. War powers belong in the hands of Congress so we have an obligation to prevent future Presidents from exploiting these AUMFs to bumble us into a new Middle East conflict.

I am glad that repealing these AUMFs has been a bipartisan effort, and I hope this process can be—it should be—a blueprint for how the Senate works over the next few years. We will have amendments without being dilatory. We will have debate without stall tactics. We will continue to look assiduously, diligently for other opportunities to advance bipartisan bills.

There are many Members and staff I wish to thank for making today's vote possible because this effort has been years—years—in the making.

First, thank you to Chairman MENENDEZ, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as Senator KAINE. To watch him work on this bill, not only day in and day out, not only month in and month out, but year in and year out because he had a such firm belief that it was the right thing to do, was a joy. Thank you also to Senator YOUNG, who worked very hard to make this happen and who brought so many of his colleagues along.

• This “buller” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1007

I want to thank staff who did the great work here too: Megan Bartley, Andrew Keller, Elisa Catalano Ewers, JC Jain, Nick Barbash, Lauren O'Brien, Brandt Anderson. And, of course, there is my staff. I have been blessed with the greatest staff in the world as you will hear about soon enough, about one of them: Lane Bodian, Meghan Taira, and Mike Kuiken.

The American people are tired of endless wars in the Middle East. We owe it to our servicemembers and our veterans, as well as to their families and all communities impacted by the war, to repeal these AUMFs today. I urge a strong "yes" vote later this morning.

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. President, on fire grants, as I said a minute ago, we are trying to move on bipartisan legislation that really matters to the average American person. One of these is going to be the Fire Grants and Safety Act. Later today, the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the Fire Grants and Safety Act.

This bipartisan legislation would make sure that both SAFER and AFG—two Federal grant programs that are paid and that volunteer firefighters rely on—remain available. If we don't extend these grants, they will expire in a few months and leave our firefighters without access to the resources they need to keep our communities safe.

Our firefighters, paid and volunteer, are brave. They risk their lives for us. They run to danger, not away from it. We need to ensure they have the equipment and personnel necessary to do their jobs for their own safety and the safety of those they protect. We need this especially in smaller, more rural, more suburban areas where there often isn't enough revenue to afford more resources.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes so we can move forward quickly on this legislation.

DEBT CEILING

Now, Mr. President, on the debt ceiling, we are almost a quarter of the way through 2023, and House Republicans have still failed to answer the most important question of their majority.

What is your plan?

What is the plan of House Republicans to raise the debt ceiling? We hear a new explanation, seemingly every day, from some new corner of the Republican Conference, but none of it adds up to what Republicans need most—a clear, detailed, and serious plan.

Even this week, Speaker MCCARTHY has, in desperation, tried another new and obviously failing approach. He laid out a new round of vague conditions, each one more amorphous than the last, and none of them with any specifics. Then he pulled a huge number out of the sky—\$4 trillion—without telling us where, when, or how we would get to it. That is not a plan. Everyone knows that.

Republicans have been utterly flailing. One day, they say they will release

a budget. Then they say they can't release a budget. One corner of the party says certain programs are off the table. Then another group of Republicans suggest the opposite. House Republican leadership is doing everything except the one thing they must do: Show the American people your plan, House Republicans. Show us your plan.

So when Speaker MCCARTHY points fingers at Democrats, all he is doing—it is so obvious—is trying to deflect from problems he has in his own conference. That is what is going on every time we hear a new idea, read a new letter, or hear a new set of talking points from the Republicans. They are far too divided to unite around a single proposal. The MAGA wing is pulling in one direction, and those in the middle are pulling another way. There is no consensus in the Republican House caucus.

The solution to the debt ceiling, however, is staring the Republicans in the face. Do what we have done before, Democrats and Republicans, under President Trump and under President Biden. Stop the brinksmanship. Stop threatening default. Work with Democrats on a clean extension of the debt ceiling. No more kicking the can down the road.

Speaker MCCARTHY, where is your plan?

Democrats and Republicans worked together, as I said, under President Trump. Even when the Republicans had the majority and the Democrats could have blocked it, we didn't. We knew our responsibilities to the people of America, who would be so devastated by a lapse in the debt ceiling and that their interest rates, their car costs, their home costs, and so much else would go up.

Well, we did this before by working together in a bipartisan way, without brinksmanship, without hostage-taking, and we should do it again this year.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, nominations on hold.

For years, for years—decades—both parties have cooperated in the Senate to confirm military promotions, non-political. It is simply the military doing its job and promoting people who deserve it. We have worked and cooperated to confirm those promotions to ensure our military's work continues unimpeded and our national security remains strong.

But, today, one Member—only one Member, the Senator from Alabama Senator TUBERVILLE—is now blocking more than 180 military promotions because he objects to women in the military accessing reproductive care. In doing so, the senior Senator from Alabama is putting the security of America in jeopardy, and he risks permanently politicizing the confirmations of routine military promotions.

As Secretary Austin warned yesterday—this is our Secretary of Defense, who is a former four-star general—"not approving the recommendations for

promotions actually creates a ripple effect throughout the force that makes us far less ready than we need to be."

"... far less ready than we need to be," Senator TUBERVILLE. This is our national security. That is what Austin said.

Now, the senior Senator from Alabama claims that his hold has nothing to do with the Supreme Court's decision on Dobbs. Of course, it does. It has everything to do with it. He is telling women in the military they are not allowed to make their own decisions about their health.

That is wrong. I assure the Senator that our women in the military are more than capable of making those decisions for themselves, and I assure the Senator that the vast majority of Americans do not agree with him that he should make the choices for women in the military, who risk their lives for us, about their health.

It is disappointing. It is disappointing to see that more of my colleagues on the other side have yet to call out the Senator from Alabama's reckless stunt. I thank those who, indeed, have raised their voices, but we need more. Republicans, who claim to be such great supporters of our military, must announce the harm the Senator from Alabama is causing.

All of us on both sides feel deeply passionate about issues from time to time. I respect that Senator TUBERVILLE, whose views dramatically differ from mine, has deep feelings about this.

Well, Senator TUBERVILLE, I have deep feelings on certain issues—so do the other 99 Senators—but we don't hold up military promotions and risk our national security because of those deep feelings.

If every one of us did what the Senator from Alabama is doing, the military would collapse. So we ought to move forward. I implore my Republican colleagues to speak out and prevail on the Senator from Alabama so we can get these promotions confirmed, get our military operating to its full capacity, and continue working to protect the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO GERRY PETRELLA

Mr. President, in tribute to one of the greatest staffers, certainly, whom I have ever had and I think that the Hill has had in a very long time, I would quote Tina Turner: "Simply the best."

I will spare him and his parents, who are in the Gallery, my singing it, although we did talk about doing karaoke together at some point.

Well, that is what they will say—what they already say about the person whom I wish to honor here today at the end of my remarks.

It is never, never easy to say goodbye to a member of your team. We in "Schumer Land," as we call our group, have such a close-knit staff. We are friends. We are pals. We have each other's backs. We protect each other. It is a beautiful thing. Even when people leave, they are still part of our family,

and we see them all the time. We saw many of them last night as we said goodbye to Gerry at a local pub—an appropriate place, I might say, to do that.

So it is never easy to say goodbye to a member of your team, but it is even harder when that person has worked with you—or put up with you depending on whom you ask—for 15 years. It is still harder when that person happens to be Gerry Petrella. His real name is Gerard Anthony Petrella, reflecting his Irish and Italian roots. I have nicknames for some of my staffers. They just pop up. He has always been Gerald even though his name is Gerard. I think it is 15 years he has been Gerald. It hasn't stuck with anyone but me, but it is there.

Well, it is with immense gratitude—sorrow as well—that I close today by saying thank you, thank you, and bidding farewell to one of the very best to ever do it here in the Senate—our policy director, Gerry.

I met Gerry when he was a staffer for a local town official.

I said: Boy, this guy is good.

And we are always on the lookout, myself and my two great chiefs, whom I am so grateful for, Mike Lynch and Martin Brennan—two tough Irish guys who have kept this Jewish kid going forward for a long time. Anyway, we always are looking out for good staff, and when we saw this guy, we said: We have got to get him.

Brennan sat down with him and said: Oh, he is good.

I sat down with him. He reminded me, last night, that I had him drive to come talk to me before the Super Bowl of the Giants and Patriots—the first one. They won two, I remind my friends from Massachusetts and New England. I met him, and I said oh boy. So Gerry began running our Long Island office.

He did an amazing job, an amazing job. So good, that after he had done 4 years there—whatever Gerry does, he works his heart out. He never burns himself out because he has got incredible energy. But he works his heart out. It was time for a change. So we asked him to come be our director—a new position—of economic development here in Washington. The number of jobs, the number of projects, the number of things he created was just amazing.

Then, of course, he became our policy director. When I became the leader, he became the policy director of the whole Senate. He did amazing things there, as I have said before.

Rarely, rarely can you say when someone leaves, no matter what else they do in their lives, they have so benefited millions of Americans, many of whom have seen the benefits already—\$35 insulin for Medicare—and many more who will see those benefits for years to come. They may not know it was Gerry Petrella who did it, but we do. We do. He changed the world.

His work was so important. We had the greatest 2 years that this Senate

has seen. We led the country, we led the party, we led everybody in doing this with the BIF, and the IRA, and the CHIPS and Science bill, and the PACT Act, and the gun bill, and so much else—marriage equality. They wouldn't have happened without Gerry Petrella. That is about the greatest compliment you can pay to someone.

So, Gerry, thank you. Thank you for never giving up on me after all these years. Thank you for coming to the office every single day and pushing, pushing, pushing.

He is not only brilliant, he not only comes with good ideas, but he is a jackhammer—rat-a-tat-tat. He keeps pushing and pushing and pushing until he gets it done.

So thank you for doing that, for setting the tone of our team, for defining our vision, for laying out a strategy and executing in good times and bad. Thank you for working to the bone to find a path forward to pass our agendas, especially when it seemed out of reach. Thank you.

And I don't want to neglect the fact that he has deep feelings on so many different issues, and he had the luxury and the ability to get those done. So I also thank Gerry for staying true to himself and his values as he worked in the maelstrom that is Senate legislating on such important bills.

Gerry is a man on fire with love for his country, love for the issues, love for the work.

Thank you, Gerry.

Thank you to Gerry's parents, who, as I mentioned, are here in the Gallery.

Thank you to George, who had both of his parents often in the office for many long hours—cute little George—and our great legislative director, Meghan Taira.

Gerry, thank you for all these great years. You will always be in our family. You will always have a place here in the Senate. My very best on the next wonderful chapter in your life. God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

COVENANT SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the events this week in Nashville, TN, are still fresh in our minds. The thought that a shooter went on the campus of a Christian school, a school for children—little children—this person who went on that campus blasted her way into the building and then took the lives of three 9-year-old children and three adults, who were the principal and staff at the school.

It is heartbreaking to think that we are reliving the scene over and over again, where our children who are sent by their loving parents off to school, lunches in hand, never came home—never came home.

We don't know all the details yet of the shooter or the weaponry which she owned at the time or used in the event, but we do know that there were weapons that we are very familiar with.

One, of course, is the AR-15, the military-style assault weapon that has, sadly, become so popular in America.

This morning's Washington Post had an editorial which touched me personally and I wanted to share this morning on the floor. I will quote from it. The editorial board wrote:

These attacks are always heart-wrenching. But they're not surprising anymore—neither the massacres themselves nor the weapons used to carry them out. Ten of the 17 deadliest mass killings in the United States since 2012 involved AR-15s. The names of the towns and cities where these tragedies took place have become familiar: Newtown, San Bernardino, Las Vegas, Parkland, Uvalde and beyond.

The Washington Post spells out the specific cities each year where these mass shootings took place with AR-15s and the number of people who were killed. I am going to read the names of these communities into the RECORD, as they should be:

Las Vegas, NV, 2017. An AR-15 weapon was used. Sixty people were killed.

Orlando—Pulse—FL, 2016. An MCX rifle. Forty-nine people killed.

Newtown, CT, Sandy Hook Elementary School, 2012. The shooter had an AR-15. The shooter killed 27 people, including those beautiful little children.

Sutherland Springs, TX, 2017. Another AR-15. Twenty-five people killed, including a pregnant woman.

Uvalde, TX, 2022. Another AR-15 military assault rifle. Twenty-one people killed.

Parkland, FL, 2018. Another AR-15, killing 17 people.

San Bernardino, CA, 2015. An AR-15 there killed 14 people.

Aurora, CO, 2012. Another AR-15 killed 12.

Pittsburgh, 2018. An AR-15 killed 11.

Boulder, CO, 2021. An AR-15 killed 10.

Buffalo, NY, 2022. An AR-15 killed 10.

They cut the list off at 10 deaths in a mass shooting involving these military-style assault weapons, so they didn't include Highland Park, IL, but I want to make a record of that.

Fourth of July 2022. An AR-15-style weapon. Seven killed and dozens wounded, including an 8-year-old boy who will be paralyzed for life.

These are the realities of the AR-15 as it is being used. It was designed to do just this: kill massive numbers of people, of human beings.

One in twenty U.S. adults owns at least one AR-15. Think of that. One out of every twenty Americans owns at least one AR-15. That is roughly 16 million people storing roughly 20 million guns designed to mow down enemies on the battlefield with brutal efficiency. That is the reality the Washington Post reports.

The rise in production of the AR-15 is stunning. AR-15s accounted for 1.2 percent of all manufactured guns in 1990—1.2 percent—and 23.4 percent of the guns produced in America in 2020. Thirty years later, almost one out of every four guns produced in the United States is an AR-15 military-style assault rifle.

The AR-15 is materially different than traditional handguns. The rifle fires very small bullets at very fast speeds. The projectiles don't move straight and smooth through human targets like those of a traditional handgun—our image of a bullet hole in a movie. Their velocity turns them unstable upon penetration so that they tumble through flesh and vital organs.

Mr. President, I thought long and hard about reading the next two or three sentences of the Washington Post editorial on the floor of the Senate. I am not going to read them because they spell out in a few words but in graphic detail what happens to the body of a child when it is struck by one of these military-style assault weapons. I can't bring myself to think that one of those parents might be listening to this Senate proceeding and have to relive the horror of the moment. But suffice it to say, what happens is devastating and horrible to any human body but certainly to the body of a small child.

Mr. President, think of Sutherland Springs, where the shooter, armed with the AR-556 Ruger, fired off 450 military-grade bullets within minutes, killing 25 people, including a pregnant woman.

Think of Dayton, where the gunman needed only 32 seconds to hit more than two dozen people with 41 bullets. That is because he was equipped with a 100-round drum magazine. Even a 30-round magazine, which is now the industry standard today, would have forced him to reload at least once. A 15-round magazine would have forced him to reload twice. The Washington Post's analysis of the time that would have taken reveals that lives could have been saved, potentially six of the nine who were killed, because of the high-capacity magazine that was attached to the gun.

There should be a ban on these high-capacity magazines. It is hard to imagine that you can listen to these numbers and the devastation of these weapons and imagine someone rationalizing that when our Founding Fathers sat down so long ago to write the Second Amendment, they envisioned what we are facing today in Nashville, TN, and in Highland Park, IL, and in 131 different instances of mass shootings so far this year. And less than 90 days have passed in this calendar year—over 131 mass shootings. And as I go through the list here of those involving AR-15s, the numbers of casualties and deaths are astounding.

This should be shameful to this great Nation, to think that the United States of America accepts this as part of our constitutional right, our constitutional responsibility, to own a mass killing weapon like the AR-15; that virtually one out of four of all guns manufactured in this country today are AR-15 weapons. Are we out of our minds to let this happen, to let children in Nashville, children in Connecticut, children be victimized or anyone be victimized

by these at a Fourth of July parade or wherever it happens to be?

I listened to my colleagues yesterday. One of them brought this up in the Senate Judiciary Committee, challenging Secretary Mayorkas of the Department of Homeland Security as to whether he supported an assault weapon ban. He said he did. I do too.

The Senator then said to him: Well, define an assault weapon for me.

Well, it is an interesting challenge. We did define it when we banned assault weapons for a period of time and saw the number of mass shootings decline dramatically in our country. But, of course, the producers of these weapons changed them just enough to be outside the definition. So there is no question that we are dealing with a moving definition, and we have to be open to the reality of it. But is this beyond us as a nation, to define a weapon in a way that we can legitimately regulate it?

Who should own an AR-15? I obviously would say the military. That is what they were designed for. Police, in extraordinary situations, might need them—I can see that—some specialized law enforcement agencies. But why in the world does an individual American need an AR-15, particularly with a high-capacity magazine? It isn't for hunting; that is for certain. It is hardly for self-defense. It can't be much for sport. What is the rationale behind this?

Then you look at the Supreme Court and the recent Bruen decision. You wonder, What are they thinking? What is going through the mind of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas as he is arguing that somehow the AR-15 military assault weapon that is killing so many Americans and groups was envisioned by the Founding Fathers when they wrote the Second Amendment? They were dealing with powdered wigs and flintlock rifles. They certainly had no idea what a high-capacity magazine can do to a large group of people, as we have seen so many times over and over.

Well, what are we going to do about it? is the obvious question. Senator, nice speech. What is next? Well, I will tell you what is next. The American people are next. If they are fed up with the situation, as I am—and I know many are—they have to make it a condition when they come to vote for Members of Congress.

Currently, the House of Representatives is under the control of the Republican Party. The likelihood that they will consider any gun safety legislation is minimal. We now have a scant majority in the Senate but not enough to break a filibuster over an issue. So we have limited opportunities.

What it takes is a decision by the American people to put an end to this madness. The people they elect to the House and Senate—there have to be simple questions asked for people to understand where they are going to stand when issues of gun safety come before them.

I will just tell you, Mr. President, that as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am sorry we don't have the votes now to act. We need to do it—not just for the great people of this Nation but also for their children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have come to speak on a different topic, but I want to commend my friend the Senator from Illinois for his comments. I agree with him.

Just yesterday, my colleague and dear friend Senator Kaine and I met with four of the families who were part of one of that litany of shootings, in Virginia Beach, where a mentally deranged individual came in and brutally murdered 12—mostly city employees and a few folks who were there to try to get city services. The anguish, pain, and hurt of these four families 4 years after the fact reflect the kind of anguish and hurt that the families in Nashville are feeling and so many countless others.

I commend the Senator again and agree that it is incumbent upon us to do our job. Thoughts and prayers are not enough.

I thank him for his comments.

S. 316

Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning where, after 2 weeks of consideration and debate—and I have not been part of all that debate. I would like to say I had been because then I could use an excuse of why my voice sounds so crummy this morning. But after 2 weeks of debate and literally the way the Senate used to function, with votes on a whole host of amendments, the Senate shortly is poised to take a truly notable action: voting to repeal not one but two authorizations for use of military force, finally taking these outdated authorizations—dating all the way back to 2002 and the previous one, back to 1991—off the books.

This is an important step for Congress in reclaiming its constitutional duties with regard to authorizing the use of U.S. forces in combat. I want to give credit to the Biden administration for supporting this repeal and to the bipartisan majority in Congress who have brought this measure to the brink of passage here in the Senate.

As we come to the floor, getting ready to take this vote, we would not have gotten here, I can assure you, without the steadfast leadership of Senator Kaine and Senator Young. These two have been partners on this effort since 2019.

For Senator Young, given his service as a marine in the decade right in the middle of these two authorizations, I know that this fight is personal for him, and I appreciate his tireless work on this. And starting off on that fight, it was a little more challenging, perhaps, on his side of the aisle, but he has been relentless. He has, through the

power of his passion and conviction, convinced a number of his colleagues to join this event.

This will go down, I believe, as one of Senator YOUNG's most significant accomplishments, accomplishments that I have worked with him on as well—for example, the CHIPS bill last year, the science bill—where he also provided enormous leadership, and I thank him for that.

But I would be remiss here today if I didn't spend the balance of my 2 or 3 minutes on the efforts of my great, great friend of 43-plus years TIM KAINE, who I think we would all agree that without his efforts, we wouldn't be here today.

For the decade—or a little more than a decade that Senator KAINE has served in this Chamber, he has been the leading voice—and a lot of times the only voice, much to the chagrin sometimes of folks in my party, much to the chagrin sometimes of the Obama administration—in working to push this Senate to live up to its constitutional duty—that duty, which is one of the most solemn ones we have, which is the exercise, the power to declare war and, ultimately, to commit our young men and women—fellow Americans—into combat.

Now, this is also very personal to Tim. We both have the honor of representing the State that has probably the highest concentration of military and veterans of any State in the country. TIM also brings the experience of being a father of a marine. I remember watching Matt grow up—our families have been friends—and when he chose to go into the marines, I don't think we were surprised, but the way he distinguished himself in that duty, serving abroad in deployments to Africa and elsewhere and then serving back here in this country, you could always tell how proud Tim and Anne felt about Matt's service. But you could also feel the extra burden of responsibility he felt to make sure what he owed not only to Matt but what he owed to, literally, every young American who served in our military.

So this has been something that—this push has really been one of the guiding principles that has directed Tim throughout his whole career in the Senate. I think back to initially him raising these issues in the Foreign Relations Committee back in 2013, saying it was time for Congress not to simply take a passive role or be a Monday morning quarterback—or, more likely, a Sunday morning quarterback—on the news shows about our constitutional responsibility in weighing in on conflicts that were taking place around the world that went well beyond the original authorizations of these AUMFs. He constantly would try to bring up this issue—again, many times being the only voice—and I know how much he respected President Obama—many times going against the position of the Obama administration. Now, other folks might have, at some point,

whether it was Democratic leadership at the White House or his fellow Members, said, you know: Can't you get off this? This makes us all feel a little uncomfortable.

And my friend TIM KAINE, it is hard to work with him. We are a great partner. I am the glass “three-quarters empty guy”; he is the glass “overfilling with confidence and hope guy.” But even that constant hope and belief, there had to be times during this decade of fighting on this when he had to have lost a little bit of faith—could this actually get done?

But that relentless optimism, that belief based in his faith, that if you keep on something, that people will ultimately do the right thing. And at the end of the day, that dogged determination, all that has come about in these last 2 weeks, is a testament to that kind of hard work.

I have watched it at times when he kept, year after year, kind of banging his head against the wall—and, again, there are a lot of us, sometimes even I felt this way—well, you know, maybe we should do it next year; maybe this is not the right time; maybe there is some other reason where, you know, this can wait a little while; it is not on the front of mind. But, for TIM KAINE, it was always front of mind. Working now with our friend TODD YOUNG—but his prior partners, great Senators who I had the opportunity to work with, Bob Corker and Jeff Flake—he has been just relentless.

And this profile and courage—profile in doing the right thing—is a great testament to the people of Virginia and, frankly, to the people in our Nation that this Senator keeps his eye on the ball.

Now, when I told Senator KAINE I might want to make these comments, he said: But, Mark, we are not at the finish line; we still have to get it through the House.

Well, I think you are going to have a remarkable vote in a few minutes due to the work of Senator YOUNG and Senator KAINE. And that overwhelming majority that is going to be posted here today, I think, will propel this action in the House. And I am very glad to see that the Speaker of the House has indicated that he will bring this legislation up.

There are more debates to be had and more votes to wrestle down and more amendments when it gets to the House; but, at the end of the day, this bill is going to become the law of the land. Congress is going to take back its Constitutional responsibility over the power to declare war and to put our troops in harm's way.

It wouldn't have happened without the great work of Senator TODD YOUNG. This debate wouldn't even have still been alive, still vibrant, still forcing us to do our job without the relentless, tireless work of a great public servant, a great Virginian, a great American—my friend TIM KAINE.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Republican whip.

PERSONAL HEALTH INVESTMENT TODAY ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as the winter season drew to a close, South Dakota's high school and college athletes were busy. And from basketball and wrestling to track and field, they have a lot to be proud of. The University of South Dakota Coyotes swept the men's and women's Summit League titles for indoor track and field for the first time in program history. Black Hills State made a Final Four run in the Division II men's basketball tournament. And South Dakota State wrestler Tanner Sloan came in second at the NCAA tournament as the Jackrabbits wrestling team notched its second highest finish as the Division I program.

As I traveled around South Dakota this month, I was able to see many of our student athletes compete. I saw Lower Brule take on White River in the high school boys' basketball semifinals in Aberdeen. I caught the girls' Class B, State B basketball tournament in Huron, where I got to see my hometown Jones County Coyotes cap off their historic season. And I was at the Summit League tournament in Sioux Falls as the South Dakota State women began their run for the tournament title.

Being back in a high school gym—seeing student athletes playing hard and working together for the good of their team—always brings back good memories. And it makes me reflect on how sports have shaped my life. In addition to instilling important values like teamwork, humility, and service, playing sports taught me the importance of staying active and made me a lifelong fitness enthusiast.

The benefits of living an active life are well-documented. Regular physical activity is associated with greater physical well-being, longer lifespans, and improved mental health. Staying active can help prevent a host of chronic conditions, including type 2 diabetes, various types of cancer, heart disease, and depression. And for those who do develop chronic conditions, exercise can help to manage them. For example, according to Mayo Clinic, physical activity can help prevent heart disease from getting worse and lower your risk of dying from the disease—or, to name another example, exercise's benefits for managing anxiety and depression are well-known.

In fact, one study found that exercise may be more effective than medication when it comes to managing anxiety and depression. And the health benefits of exercise can also help individuals save money on healthcare as they age.

One study found—and here I quote a New York Times article:

People who start to exercise before or during middle age typically save anywhere between \$824 to \$1,874 annually on healthcare costs after retirement, and the earlier they start their workouts, the greater those savings can be.

That is from a study conducted by the New York Times.

Unfortunately, despite exercise's significant health and even financial benefits, a lot of American adults and children either don't exercise at all or don't get enough exercise. There are a number of reasons for that, of course, but one disincentive to exercising can be the cost of some exercise equipment and programs.

Some of the tools that can help people be more active—like a gym membership or fitness equipment—can be too costly for some Americans. Even registration for youth sports leagues can be expensive, making it harder for some families to take advantage of these activities' health benefits. That is why I recently introduced the Personal Health Investment Today Act—it will be called the PHIT Act—with Senator MURPHY.

The PHIT Act would allow Americans to use a portion of the money in their pretax health savings account or flexible spending account for fitness-related expenses. It wouldn't cover things like an expensive new putter or fees at a country club. But it would allow individuals to use up to \$1,000—or \$2,000 for married couples—from their HSA or FSA to invest in preventive health tools like exercise equipment or a gym membership—investments that can result in meaningful long-term health benefits as well as healthcare savings.

The PHIT Act would also allow families to use these pretax dollars for youth sports registration fees and some of the gear that kids need to participate in sports. The typical family pays hundreds of dollars a year for registration and equipment for youth sports.

Many families say sports can be a strain on their budgets, something that has only become more pronounced as inflation has gone up. And, unsurprisingly, some families have had to reduce their kids' level of participation in sports because of the cost.

As I said earlier, I learned a lot by playing sports while I was growing up, and I am sure I am not alone. Youth sports are one of the best ways to build lifelong healthy habits. They help kids build strong friendships and learn important skills and values that they carry throughout their lives. And the PHIT Act would help reduce some of the cost barriers that many families face when it comes to getting their kids involved in sports.

With more and more of our life spent with technology, we can't overestimate the value of spending time disconnected from screens and being active. Fortunately, no matter how well my bracket is doing, watching March Madness always makes me eager to "lace 'em up," as they say, and get on the court myself. Although, I will be honest, I spend, these days, more time trying to keep up with my grandkids than I do working on my jump shot.

But whether you are playing in a rec league or with your kids, going to a

gym or making a walk or a run as part of your routine, staying active throughout your life is an important part of staying healthy. And with the warmer weather inching closer every day, it is a great time to get active.

The PHIT Act is a commonsense way to help encourage more Americans to invest in tools that make fitness goals easier to attain. And I will continue to work to pass the PHIT Act and promote healthy living for more Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled votes: Myself, for up to 10 minutes; Senator Kaine, for up to 10 minutes; Senator Risch, for up to 5 minutes; Senator Menendez, for up to 5 minutes; and Senator Schumer, for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 316

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleague, the great Senator from Virginia, Senator TIM Kaine, on the floor of the Senate today. And as we await this final vote—final passage of the repeal of the Authorizations for Use of Military Force in 1991, the Gulf war, and, in 2002, the Iraq war—I reflect on just how much work it took to get here, how much persistence. And I thank Senator Kaine for sticking it out.

A lot has happened over the last couple of decades.

A lot has happened over the last couple of decades. Twenty years ago, American soldiers were fighting that war in Iraq. Today, they are still there. They are advising Iraq's army at the invitation of the current government. Twenty years ago, Iraq was our enemy. Today Iraq is a strategic partner, an ally in advancing stability across the Middle East. A lot has changed in the last 20 years; and, yet, according to our laws, today we are still at war with Iraq.

This isn't just the result of an oversight. It is an intentional abdication of this body, of its constitutional role in America's national security. Allowing it to continue is a strategic mistake. It is a mistake that disrespects the sacrifices of our soldiers and their Iraqi partners as well. It is one that could endanger their work across the Middle East, and it is central to our national security that we set this right.

Here is why.

Iran has designs on a path to the Mediterranean Sea. The world's leading exporter of terror wants to build a route to move manpower and materiel to its proxies all across the region. Once it reaches the sea, it will establish a foothold to threaten Europe. This terrorism thoroughfare would run through Syria, through Lebanon, and, of course, through Iraq. Iran has sent many thousands of soldiers into Syria

to prop up Dictator Bashar Al Assad and co-opted regions of that war-torn nation. Lebanon's institutions are weak. Hezbollah, with Iran's backing, dominates many sectors of the governments and the country.

Iraq cannot follow this path. It cannot become a satellite of Iran, and Iran cannot be permitted unrestricted access across the region.

Our advisers are fortifying and working with the Iraqi Army to prevent this dangerous future.

But we are undertaking this vital mission with a nation we are still technically at war with. The authorizations for both the 1991 Gulf war and 2002 Operation Iraqi Freedom are both still on the books. These authorizations for long-ended wars passed almost entirely by Members of Congress long-retired. These authorizations are outdated. They are a detriment to our national security strategy, and they are an abdication of Congress's constitutional role in declaring and, yes, ending wars.

In the centuries before our revolution, Kings waged wars—wars that their subjects fought. Reflecting on this history, our Founding Fathers placed the power to make war not with the executive, but with this branch, the legislative branch. And it is here in our Congress, in the people's Congress, they determine that debate and deliberation and consensus should precede a decision to go to war or to avert it.

You see, the Framers placed this great responsibility in our hands—our hands. And we let it slip right through them. By allowing these authorizations to live on long past their purpose, we have forfeited the power to make and to oversee wars to the White House. Presidents of both parties—of both parties—have employed specious legal reasoning and used them as a justification for military interventions wholly unrelated to their original missions.

So here is the choice before us: We repeal these authorizations; we restore a part of our system of checks and balances; or we let them live on, extending a permanent blank check for Presidents to bypass Congress in authorizing military action. That is the choice.

By doing the former, we not only take a step towards realigning the function of our government with its Constitution, we also send an important message to Prime Minister Sudani that our interests are shared; our nations are allies; that we will continue to partner with Iraq to train and equip its Army in their fight against ISIS; and that we oppose Iran's violation of Iraq's sovereignty and its ambitions of regional dominance—ambitions that endanger the world far beyond the Middle East.

And let us not forget that in case of urgent national security emergencies, even after repealing these authorizations, Presidents can still, as they can now, invoke their article II war powers.

In closing, I just want to underscore the heroic legislative efforts—the heroic leadership—that my colleague TIM

KAINE has shown throughout this long effort to get this legislation on the floor to persuade those around the country that this should remain a first-order priority; to persuade people in both parties that this merits our time and our attention; that these repeal efforts are important not just to this generation, but to future generations.

Thank you to Senator KAINE and his team.

I want to thank my team—my amazing national security team and legislative team—for their hard work on this effort, as well.

I want to reiterate something I know that Senator KAINE agrees with: that repealing these war authorizations will give a greater voice to those whom we represent. We live with the possibility every day that our men and women in uniform could be called away to fight, to sacrifice their very lives for our freedom. We dread for that moment to come. But if it does, we must be certain that the American people are united behind the decisions we make here and that our intentions are clear to our military commanders.

By reclaiming our war powers, by restoring the open, civil, but passionate debates about matters of war and peace, we will do exactly that. And our Nation and its allies will be stronger and safer because of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the United States invaded Iraq following congressional authorization exactly 20 years ago, March 19 and 20, 2003.

In that war, nearly 4,500 Americans lost their lives and more than 31,000 American troops were wounded—some grievously—who will carry that wound for the rest of their lives. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians were killed.

I rise thinking about all of them as we come close to a vote to declare these wars are over.

It wasn't too long into the war when criticism of the decision to go to war began. There is no criticism of the heroism of the American troops who served ably, who did so well, who protected their colleagues, who protected civilian life the best they could. But there began to be criticism of the rationale for the war.

Two of the rationales for this war were that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. That was very convincing to many colleagues here. It turned out not to be true. And another of the rationales that was occasionally advanced was that Iraq had participated in the 9/11 attack. That proved not to be true.

So much of the analysis of the Iraq war, looking backward over 20 years and lessons learned, has focused upon the rationales advanced that turned out not to be true.

But there was another challenge; and today is an effort, in many ways, to try

to fix that challenge. And the challenge was this: We rushed into it. There were 4,500 who died; 31,000 who were wounded, the hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians.

What we have to contemplate is the reality that we rushed into a war—this body rushed into a war. The Iraq war resolution was filed in the House in early October 2002, assigned to a committee, and came out of the House in a week. The resolution was pending in the Senate—no committee action, no committee opportunity for inquiry, amendment, debate. It was pending in the Senate for 3 days—3 days.

The Senate voted to go to war—a war that has had massive consequences—with a total of 3 days of analysis. Taking the time to be the greatest deliberative body in the world does not guarantee that we will get everything right. But short-circuiting a decision, especially a decision of such magnitude as to whether the United States should go to war, maximizes the chance that we, as fallible humans, will get it wrong.

I believe many of the challenges that we faced in the Iraq war began with that rush. I am very dedicated to the proposition—and I have been since I came here—that the United States and the article I branch of Congress, we should never be pushed into a war and we should never be rushed into a war.

The repeal of the 1991 and 2002 AUMF has been on the floor of the Senate for 2 weeks, not 3 days. The repeal has been pending before the body since 2019. It has had two different markups in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where members got chances to offer amendment and debate and vote twice. The effort over the last 13 days has involved 11 votes on amendments in this body. In the declaration of war, there were only five amendment votes.

We have given dramatically more time in this body to the question of whether we end two wars—one declared in 1991 and one declared in 2002—than was given to the momentous question of whether we should start a war.

I think that is a lesson that we should all absorb and learn from. I want to thank my colleagues who have been so helpful in this regard. Senator YOUNG has been such an able colleague in this path from the very day he came into this body and was assigned to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; his bona fides, having worked with a great Member of the Senate, Senator Lugar; and his marine service made him somebody who grabbed this issue immediately.

I want to thank the Senate Foreign Relation Committee's leadership, Senators MENENDEZ and RISCH, both of whom have cooperated to try to give this the attention and deliberation it deserves. I will say this about Senator RISCH: We have had disagreements along the way, but here is a man who knows how to disagree without being disagreeable—curmudgeonly, yes, but not disagreeable.

I also want to thank Senator SCHUMER for being committed to make this happen.

Also to Senator WARNER for his pep talks when I would get down about how come I am not able to convince anybody. He would give me pep talks, and I appreciated his comments.

I appreciate the outside groups that weighed in in significant ways—American Legion, Concerned Veterans for America, Friends Committee on National Legislation, and so many others.

I very much want to thank my staff, many of whom are here, who have worked with me on this and, probably like Senator WARNER at some points, wondered why I was so obsessed about it. Can't we move on and do something else? I learned early, I am not going to get my way by looks, so I better get it by persistence. And this has been one of those efforts where persistence has helped.

And the passage of 20 years, and even the anniversary—the 20th anniversary, has kind of opened a reflective moment where I think we are moving in the right direction.

Last thing I want to say is this: This is, obviously, very important to me, personally, on this topic, coming from a State that is so military in our focus and proudly so, being the father of a marine—that makes a difference to me. But even if this debate were about another topic, I am so glad that we just spent time deliberating, for gosh sake, instead of rushing to a war in 3 days. We had a very robust process of full committee consideration, of full Senate floor debate, of amendments—some that were easy and some that were really hard; some that were really close and some that weren't so close.

We showed that we can operate in what I have never really experienced in the time I have been here, but what I have had glimpses of in this debate: We can operate according to sort of a regular order—the way we should do things. And regular order is kind of a phrase; who knows what that means?

It means deliberation when we are making important decisions, allowing the committees to take their time to do the work, allowing committee members to shape a bill, getting the bill on the floor, giving it the time it deserves. That is what the Senate has been known for since 1787.

We have declined in our ability or, perhaps, our willingness to do it the old-fashioned way, but when we do it the old-fashioned way and we deliberate, we make better decisions. And I am proud to have been part of a decision-making process that has enabled all 100 Senators to participate in a meaningful way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise to voice my support for S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq. Sending America's sons and daughters to fight in foreign lands has serious consequences. Those who volunteer for military service, as well as their families, agree to

carry things with them for their lifetimes—sometimes difficult and painful things—all at the behest of the U.S. government and on behalf of the American people.

I am grateful for and thank those servicemembers who bravely conducted themselves in Iraq with honor, restraint, and in accordance with American values and ideals. With that important preface, let me say clearly: I opposed the Iraq war. I opposed the Iraq war before I was elected to Congress, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I oppose it today.

I believe that by any objective measure, the 2002 U.S. invasion of Iraq was among the greatest foreign policy disasters in my lifetime. Not only did it cause death and immense suffering of thousands of Americans and hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, but it also ignited a series of regional tensions and tertiary conflicts that have carried on for decades.

Both the Gulf War and the 2002 invasion of Iraq required legal authorities. The Iraq authorizations of military force were legally necessary and largely supported at the time. However, very practically, we no longer need an authorization for use of military force against a country we now regard as a partner and to which we provide hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid. This bill recognizes the positive evolution of our relations with the Government of Iraq. We will continue to work with our Iraqi partners to limit our military presence and narrowly define the actions our servicemembers are authorized to take. It is also important to note that this resolution will have no impact whatsoever on current U.S. military operations.

Some opponents of this bill have suggested that repealing the authorizations for use of force will embolden our adversaries or exhibit America's weakness. To the contrary, whether one supported or opposed the invasions of Iraq 31 and 20 years ago, it is important to repeal these antiquated relics of history.

As national security threats arise, they should be properly addressed. The President can request congressional authorization for the use of military force with properly debated justifications, after which, Members of Congress will vote their conscience and America's will. This bill does nothing to restrict presidential powers of this nor future Presidents. America will defend herself—always. However, it is critical that America's use of force be thoughtful and deliberate, informed by accurate intelligence, and used only when necessary to preserve and protect our vital national security interests.

Over the years, I have consistently voted to repeal the Iraq authorizations for use of military force. I commend my colleagues, Senators Kaine and Young, for their tenacity and determination to see these repeals through. I also strongly support a review of the

2001 authorization for use of military force which has been the legal basis for actions far beyond what was ever intended after the attacks of 9/11.

For the task at hand, however, I urge all Senators to support S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. Risch. Mr. President, thank you very much and thank you to Senator Kaine.

I will start with this. There are a lot of things he said that I agree with, and, particularly, that part about him not getting very far with his looks and instead using persistence. I think he is absolutely correct in that regard.

Senator Kaine has been a true, committed, good-faith warrior on this issue, as has Senator Young, and some of the things that were said out here are absolutely accurate and deserve to be underscored and things that I agree with.

First of all, I really appreciate Senator Kaine pointing out the fact that the deliberations on this particular repeal of the AUMF to get the rule off of the books regarding war has taken a whole lot longer and a lot more deliberation than the actual passage of it to get into the war.

It is easy to stand here and say that people were wrong who did this 20 years ago. I don't know how many are left. There is only a handful, maybe half a dozen, who were on this floor at the time they voted for it. In their defense, of course, they had information that was very different than the information that we have today, which is unfortunate, because, as you have pointed out, there has been a lot of harm done as a result of this.

So we should start with that, and that is that one of the most important things we do here in Congress is deliberating whether or not to send our sons and daughters into harm's way in war. There is nothing more somber than that, and to those who actually fought in this war, the view that America has toward them of appreciation for their taking up the arms when we asked them to do so cannot be overstated. It is a tremendous sacrifice that they have made, and we owe them a lot.

Having said that, I come back to what Senator Kaine has said for a long time. If that vote were held today, I think it would be unanimous that we not pull the trigger as was done 20 years ago. But that was then and this is now, and the information is very different.

So to the men and women in uniform, their service was honorable. Less than 1 percent of Americans raise their hands to answer the Nation's call when this happens, and we have to commend them for that.

While I support the repeal of the 1991 Gulf war authorization, I don't support the repeal of this 2002 AUMF at this time. This needs to be repealed; there is no question about it. It should be re-

placed by something, and that is one of the real problems here, because the debate to do that has been ongoing for as long as I have been here, and we have been unable to land on the same point to get it done. Again, we mostly agree, but there is handful of disagreements on it. So with that, I cannot vote for it at this time.

Part of the problem—well, there are two problems here: One is the fluidity in Iraq at this time, and the second one Senator Young properly and clearly outlined what the ambitions of Iran are. The fluidity in Iraq and the ambitions of Iran are the two reasons why I am opposed to repealing at this time.

Iraq itself is a less-than-perfect security partner. All of us on Foreign Relations have dealt with that issue over and over again, as we have had ups and downs there. They are a less-than-perfect partner.

I have serious concerns about the influence of the Iranian-aligned militias, which I know my friends do also. These are real problems. Across multiple administrations—both Republican and Democrat administrations—the 2002 AUMF has been used to address threats emanating from Iraq.

Specifically, multiple administrations have relied on its authority to address the threat from Iran-backed militias, and Iran is clearly the problem here. I have been in the room when these decisions were made. I have participated in those decisions, and the 2002 AUMF was a factor in those decisions.

Should the statutory authority fall away, we are only left with the President's constitutional article II powers to protect Americans. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and some on my side of the aisle are quick to point out that the President's constitutional authorities are used as an excuse to support repeal, what we are doing here. But those constitutional authorities are unfettered and really unrestrained as far as the President is concerned.

So by repealing this, instead of reasserting congressional authority, we are actually ceding solely to the President, the executive branch, which no one in this room wants to do.

Further repeal signals finality and an end to hostilities but, the Iranian-backed militias continue to attack us. Iran has long sought to eject the United States from Iraq, but Iran and its proxies have attacked American troops and diplomats over 80 times just since President Biden took office and with only a few U.S. responses.

It is clear that Iran doubts American resolve. I stand here today to say to Iran: Have no doubts. We do have resolve.

Just last week, we lost yet another American in Syria at the hands of an Iranian-supported militia. It is objectionable that the administration didn't notify Congress of this attack until after we completed debate on relevant amendments and had adjourned for the week.

I know my colleagues who are on the other side of this issue probably have the same bad feelings about that that I do. This was not right, to withhold this information from us.

The Biden administration talks about defending our interests and deterring Iran. The administration launched a strike in retaliation for killing that American last Thursday, but in response the Iran-backed militias simply conducted an even larger attack against us.

The truth is the administration is failing and has failed in its attempts to deter Iran, and today we are in not a very good position in that regard. That is why this repeal sends an additional dangerous message at a poor time and further weakens U.S. engagement in the region.

It is clear the region sees the Biden administration sitting on the sidelines. This repeal will only add fuel to the narrative that the United States is disengaging from the region, which we hear all the time. We should remember that great power competition is global, not just in Asia and the Pacific, though, of course, those issues have raised their ugly head in recent years.

I also remain unconvinced that the administration has conducted any meaningful consultations with Iraq, Israel, or other partners on the repeal of this authority and how those reactions may affect U.S. burdens and commitments in the region. Consultation with our partners is always important.

Finally, turning to detention authority, for years the 2002 AUMF has been cited as authority for detention for known captured terrorists. Last week, I put forward an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that repeal of this authority would not harm detention authority or the U.S. litigation positions against detained terrorists. If a court were to find that the 2001 AUMF did not provide legal authority for detention, which has not been settled at this point, supplemental legal authorities like the 2002 AUMF would be absolutely critical.

I sincerely would like to support this repeal—I really would. And I hope to be here when we do get to repeal at some point down the line, but now is not the time for it. The realities on the ground convince me I cannot support repeal at this time. We have got to deal with the world as it is, and, as a result of that, I am compelled to vote no.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and thank you for all those who have worked on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this vote that we are about to take today has deep personal significance for me and for many others. For me, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I finally have come full circle from my vote in the House of Representatives 21 years ago when I did not support the 2002 AUMF.

I have, for my 31 years in Congress, had a standard. If the cause is right and the Nation needs it, then I will vote to send my son and daughter into war, and I will vote to send anyone else's sons and daughters into war. But if the cause is not right and the Nation truly doesn't need it, not only will I not send my son and daughter into war, I won't vote to send anyone else's sons and daughters into war.

And, at that time, as a Member of the House, I did my due diligence with all the evidence that was available, and I saw no clear and present danger, no imminent threat to the United States, and, above all, no evidence—underline “evidence”—of weapons of mass destruction. So I voted no. I was in the minority at the time, and it was, in many respects, a tough vote, but it was the right vote.

It is significant for some of my fellow Senators who also themselves, many, have fought in the war in Iraq, and I echo what Senator RISCH, the ranking member said. When our sons and daughters answer the call, they don't say: Is this the right or wrong war?

They just say: I am here to serve.

And so we honor their service, both in the Iraq war and in the Gulf war before it. And I think what we do today, actually, is the ultimate way in which we honor it. It is significant for those whose sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, friends and loved ones have fought, and it is significant because, for the first time in five decades, when Congress repealed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, we are ending a war—the first time in five decades.

So, today, I want to speak about what we are accomplishing together as we turn the page on that war and that chapter of American foreign policy. It has taken 21 long years for this body to reevaluate the adoption of the 2002 AUMF, and, today, we are working together—and this is the ultimate expression of what this body should be; working together, Democrats and Republicans—to support repeal.

And I want to salute the majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, for giving us the time on the floor and a process for which the weightiness of what we are doing could be fully considered, and I salute him for doing so.

That makes this historic vote a bipartisan vote. With this vote, we make clear that the Iraq of 2023 is not the Iraq of 2003. Far from being a menace to the region, today's Iraq is a willing U.S. partner that seeks closer integration with its Arab neighbors.

With this vote, we can show the world that the United States is a strong partner, that we are not an occupying force, that we engage with partner countries when their interests are aligned with ours.

This vote shows that, while we still face challenges and threats to U.S. interests—and I agree with my colleague about the challenges of Iran. No one has fought harder for over two decades on the question of meeting the chal-

lenge of Iran, but this is not about Iran. This is about Iraq. Saddam Hussein is gone. The Iraq of 2002 is not the Iraq of 2023.

This vote shows that, while we still face challenges and threats to U.S. interests, the 1991 and 2002 authorizations for use of military force do not address those threats and are not necessary for the United States to defend against them.

This vote shows that Congress is prepared to claw back our constitutional role in deciding how and when our Nation goes to war and also when it should end wars. It also protects against future administrations abusing authorizations that outlive their mandate but remain on the books.

We can take our responsibilities once again to call if the Nation needs it and the President comes and says: I need an authorization for the use of force because country X is challenging the national security of the United States. We can do that. But we should not allow any President to use an authorization that was never intended for country X or the circumstances of that to be the excuse to go to war without coming to Congress. So I see it differently than my colleague.

To be clear, this vote has nothing to do with Iran and in no way diminishes our ability to protect U.S. interests against Iranian aggression.

It has taken a long time to get here. I want to commend my colleague Senator KAINE, who has been a constant clarion call of our responsibility and pricked the conscience of the committee and the Senate on several occasions to get to this point, and also Senator YOUNG, who has been joining him in that effort, for their stalwart commitment to get this done and to see this through to such a momentous conclusion.

This is a defining moment. I urge all my colleagues to vote to repeal the 1991 and 2002 authorizations to use military force in Iraq. We owe it to those who made the ultimate sacrifice and to their families. We owe it to the servicemembers who again may be called upon to fight. We owe it to them to demonstrate that we take our solemn duty seriously and to do what is right.

I am proud that we are taking this step today. We should all be proud of the history we are making together to pass this legislation with a strong bipartisan vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my colleagues, our chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ; Senator KAINE, who has worked on this bill not for days and not for months but for years and never gave up hope; Senator YOUNG; Senator RISCH; and so many others—thank you, Senator YOUNG—who worked so hard to make this day happen.

Twenty years after the start of the Iraq war, the Senate finally, finally, finally declares today the time has come

to repeal the legal authorities that began that war in the first place.

This is bipartisan, and that is one of the beauties of this. Democrats and Republicans joined to say that it has been long enough, that the Iraq war has long been over. These authorizations for the use of force against Iraq are no longer necessary for our security.

Make no mistake, this vote repealing the Iraq war powers is one for the history books.

The American people, as we know, are tired of endless wars in the Middle East. Every year we keep these AUMFs on the books is another chance for future administrations to abuse them.

We owe it to the over 4,000 who died in Iraq, to their families, to our servicemembers who served there, to our veterans, and all of the communities impacted by the war—we owe it to all of them to act.

There is a very good chance that both Chambers can pass these AUMF repeals before the end of this year so this bill can be signed into law. This is not just going to be a one-House action. We have good support in the House of Representatives, the President is for it, and the odds are high that this much needed legislation will become law.

Again, I hope this process can be a blueprint for how the Senate works over the next few years. We sat down with our Republican colleagues—and, of course, it is the right of the minority to offer amendments—and came to an agreement. The amendments were not dilatory. The amendments were not gotcha. They were sincere attempts to change the bill. But by allowing amendments, we allowed this bill to go forward, and we would like that to be a metaphor for the future.

We will look diligently, assiduously for opportunities to continue the Senate working successfully on bipartisan legislation in the future.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. 316

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired, amendment No. 15 is withdrawn, and the bill is considered read a third time.

The amendment (No. 15) was withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Heinrich	Paul
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Hoeven	Rosen
Braun	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Budd	King	Schmitt
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Lee	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Lummis	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cramer	Menendez	Vance
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Welch
Grassley	Murray	Whitehouse
Hassan	Ossoff	Wyden
Hawley	Padilla	Young

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Fischer	Romney
Blackburn	Graham	Rounds
Boozman	Hagerty	Rubio
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Mullin	Tillis
Cruz	Ricketts	Tuberville
Ernst	Risch	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Fetterman
Feinstein	McConnell

(Applause.)

The bill (S. 316) was passed as follows:

S. 316

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1; 105 Stat. 3; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Michigan.

S. 870

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, fire departments across the country rely on critical Federal resources that keep firefighters and emergency responders safe. These heroes need our support as they continue protecting our communities. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Fire Grants and Safety Act.

This bipartisan bill reauthorizes two vital grant programs administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and also reauthorizes the U.S. Fire Administration.

Fire departments depend on these programs to address staffing needs, re-

place outdated equipment, fund fire training and education programs, and invest in health screenings for firefighters in the line of duty.

It is clear that, without these grant programs, many fire departments, especially those in smaller or more rural communities, would simply not be able to invest in their vehicles, equipment, or training that they need to protect their communities.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to move forward with this important, bipartisan legislation that will help ensure that our firefighters and first responders have what they need.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Christopher Murphy, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Jeanne Shaheen, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Mazie Hirono, Cory A. Booker, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Baldwin	Britt	Cassidy
Barrasso	Brown	Collins
Bennet	Budd	Cornyn
Blackburn	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Capito	Cotton
Booker	Cardin	Cramer
Boozman	Carper	Crapo
Braun	Casey	Cruz

Daines	Lujan	Schatz
Duckworth	Lummis	Schmitt
Durbin	Manchin	Schumer
Ernst	Markey	Scott (FL)
Fischer	Marshall	Scott (SC)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Shaheen
Graham	Merkley	Sinema
Grassley	Moran	Smith
Hagerty	Mullin	Stabenow
Hassan	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hawley	Murphy	Tester
Heinrich	Murray	Thune
Hickenlooper	Ossoff	Tillis
Hirono	Padilla	Tuberville
Hoeven	Paul	Van Hollen
Hyde-Smith	Peters	Vance
Johnson	Reed	Warner
Kaine	Ricketts	Warnock
Kelly	Risch	Warren
Kennedy	Romney	Welch
King	Rosen	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Rounds	Wicker
Lankford	Rubio	Wyden
Lee	Sanders	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Fetterman
Feinstein	McConnell

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 0.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO RE- VISED DEFINITION OF WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 27, which is at the desk; and that at 2:30 p.m. today, it be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on the passage of the joint resolution without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense

and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I have the honor of being the chair of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee here in the U.S. Senate, and there has been a lot of activity during the Biden administration that deals with our economy.

The Biden administration has a proud record of legislative accomplishments, from the American Rescue Plan to the bipartisan infrastructure bill, to the Safer Communities Act, to the Inflation Reduction Act, to the CHIPS and Science bill, to the PACT bill, and the list goes on and on. But I want to talk a little bit about the accomplishments under the Biden administration for small businesses, and I am very proud of what we have been able to do to help small businesses in our country.

We have 33.2 million small business owners in America. They are the drivers of our economy. We say they are the backbone of our economy; I think they are also the backbone of our communities. They create jobs, and they do most of the innovation that we see. It makes America more competitive and creates more job opportunities and economic opportunities.

Over 99 percent of our businesses in the United States are small businesses, and nearly 50 percent of all U.S. employees work for small companies. So it is critically important that we pay attention to our small businesses, and, of course, it was challenging during the COVID-19 pandemic.

I will just give you one example of why it is so important, giving one example in Maryland. I am sure you could give an example in every one of our States. This past Friday, I was at Sabatino's restaurant in Little Italy, Baltimore. We see many times that the economic growth of ethnic communities has been spurred by innovation by small companies. Sabatino's is one of those restaurants, which is iconic to Baltimore today. It was started in 1955 by two individuals, two immigrants who started Sabatino's restaurant. It is now an iconic restaurant in Baltimore where we like to go for good political discussion. It is in a pretty famous neighborhood. It is where NANCY PELOSI grew up. It has incredible food. It is for good company and good food, and it is an anchor in that community for its economic growth.

There are a lot of small business owners who are in that neighborhood who are continuing to provide job opportunities and economic growth and a future for Little Italy in Baltimore.

We could give many, many examples of that type of activity by a small company, a small business, that has really saved a neighborhood and preserved it for its future.

The Biden administration has a proud record in support of small busi-

nesses. Let me just give you some of the numbers. Twenty twenty-one was a record year for the growth of small businesses in this country. We had the largest number of new business growth, small business growth, in the history of America, and it was led by women-owned small businesses. Women of color led among the women business entrepreneurs.

This is attributable to the fact that the Biden administration has been concentrating on helping our small businesses but has paid particular attention to those small businesses located in traditionally underserved communities. That has led to programs that have helped. I will give you one example: women's business centers. The President announced just this week increasing the number of women's business centers in our community.

When President Biden took the oath of office, we had one women's business center in Maryland, and it was doing really great service, helping women get through the maze of bureaucracies and obstacles that were in their way to start a small business or grow a small business. It was located in Rockville, MD, and provided great help. Today, we have four women's business centers in Maryland, one located in Salisbury, which is a rural part of our State, to help women business entrepreneurs in rural Maryland. We have one at Morgan State University, a historic Black college in Maryland, and it is an HBCU that has provided tremendous opportunities for minority business owners. We just recently opened another women's business center at Bowie State University, an HBCU in the Washington area, in Prince George's County.

These are concrete steps the Biden administration has taken to not only grow our small business opportunities in America but to make sure we pay attention to those who have been left behind in the past.

Let me just give you another example of how we have delivered through the Biden administration to help our small business community.

We delivered for the people, for individuals like Carl Williams of Los Angeles, who founded Royal Men Solutions. After he was released from prison, Carl heard about the Minority Business Development Agency's Entrepreneurship Education for Formerly Incarcerated Persons Center in Los Angeles. His dream of becoming a third-generation carpenter and making his father proud took flight through this program.

Carl explains, and I quote:

The information the MBDA Center afforded me was invaluable, teaching me the elevator pitch, understanding my competition, standing out as a custom furniture builder, and knowing my value. All of their advice was an intricate part of my growth and development in the business world.

Well, one of the great accomplishments of the Biden administration was to help our returning citizens, those impacted under the criminal justice system, to give them an opportunity,

and they are taking advantage of that thanks to the Biden administration.

Also in the Biden administration was the passage of the bipartisan infrastructure package. Through the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, we were able to pass legislation that establishes in statute the Minority Business Development Agency that Carl depended upon—the MBDA.

We authorized \$110 million per year for the Agency through fiscal year 2025 and elevated the office by creating an Under Secretary position to lead the Agency. The funds will expand the geographic reach of the MBDA by authorizing the creation of regional MBDA offices and rural business centers and creating the Parren J. Mitchell Entrepreneurship Education Grants Program to support minority entrepreneurs at HBCUs and MSIs.

I particularly like the program being named after the former Congressman Parren J. Mitchell, a Congressman from Baltimore, who was chair in the House of Representatives of the Small Business Committee and was responsible for our first efforts to set aside to help small businesses and minority small businesses.

We delivered for founders like Miles Barr, Richard Lunt, and Vladimir Bulovic, who at MIT imagined a world where they could seamlessly help limit our carbon footprint through transparent solar technologies. The company has already started producing small-size windows that reduce energy and may help reduce our total national energy consumption by up to 12 percent. Thanks to funding from the Small Business Innovation Research or SBIR Program, as we all know it, they were able to spin out of MIT and embark on this private endeavor.

In the 117th Congress, with President Biden's leadership, we were able to extend the life of and improve the SBIR and STTR Programs. Through the SBIR and STTR Extension Act of 2022, the Small Business Innovation Research and the Small Business Technology Transfer Programs were reauthorized, including their related pilot programs, through September 30, 2025. The legislation also includes language that ensures the largest SBIR and STTR award winners are adequately transitioning and commercializing their technologies.

These actions we take have real consequences. These are companies that need to have that ability to participate in government research. That is what the SBIR Program and the STTR Program do. The Federal Agencies that have the largest amounts of research must engage smaller companies.

Now, guess which Agency is the strongest proponent of the SBIR Program that we reauthorized under President Biden's leadership? It is the Department of Defense because they know these small, innovative tech companies are going to give them the technology they need to keep America safe, and they are.

I look at my own State of Maryland, where we are blessed to have so many high-tech companies that are working in defense, working in healthcare, working in communications, and working in the environment and energy. Thanks to our actions, these companies can now grow and do their work and help our country solve our problems through the passage of the SBIR and STTR Extension Act of 2022.

The Biden administration delivered for veterans, women entrepreneurs, rural communities, and the mom-and-pop shops that keep our communities vibrant.

Because of COVID-19, we knew this was not a time to sit back and watch the small businesses we loved close their doors. Instead, we rolled up our sleeves and took care of Main Street. While we saw too many small businesses close, we saw many of them come back stronger than ever before, and entrepreneurs did the same. In a remarkable comeback under the Biden administration, we have seen 10.5 million new business applications, making 2021 and 2022 record years.

Through the Inflation Reduction Act, we helped small businesses reduce their energy costs while improving their environmental sustainability.

Through the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, small businesses across the country will receive the help they need to modernize the way they do business in order to grow and succeed.

Look, I want American entrepreneurs and small business owners to know that they should dream big. Our Nation is on path to make those big dreams a reality. I am very proud of the progress we have been able to make during these past 2 years. I am looking forward to working on behalf of small businesses in this Congress with my partner Senator ERNST on the Small Business Committee.

I just want the small business owners of America to know that we are on their side, and we are going to continue to provide the help so they can help America grow. They are the backbone of our economy and the backbone of our communities, and we stand with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Madam President, I come before this Chamber alongside my colleagues from Maryland and Nevada to talk about the importance of our small businesses in New Mexico and across the country.

I also want to thank the chair of the Small Business Committee, Mr. BEN CARDIN, for the work he has consistently done, his leadership in this space, but his understanding of what is happening across the country and the need to fight alongside our small businesses to make things better for them. So I want to thank the chairman as well.

For the past 2 years, the Senate Democratic majority and the White

House have made it our mission to support and revitalize the small businesses that are the backbone of our local communities. We have been hard at work building economic security for the middle class, putting people back to work, and investing in the American dream.

I know every Senator in this Chamber and all Americans have a small business they depend on to get from one place to another, from one day to the next. For me, one of them is in Santa Fe, NM, Midtown Bistro, an incredible location run by a very extraordinary family. Anytime you want a good meal and a warm welcome, you just go on down to Midtown Bistro. This was the dream of restaurant owners Edmund Catanach, Melissa Salazar, and Angel Estrada—to make folks feel at home, and they do.

But when the COVID-19 pandemic hit, restaurants and small businesses all across America struggled to make ends meet without daily customers or revenue. Midtown Bistro, like so many family-owned small businesses, looked to the Federal Government and received a grant to keep things running and fulfill payroll each and every week. Melissa said that without those funds, they would have had to close their doors after decades of serving the Santa Fe community. Thankfully, that didn't happen.

Edmund, Melissa, and Angel's story is the story of thousands of small business owners who earned grant funding from the Federal Government in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. We are extremely proud to have secured more than \$169 million in restaurant revitalization funds for restaurants like theirs throughout New Mexico. And that does not include everyone.

One of the first things congressional Democrats did when President Biden took office 2 years ago was expand the Paycheck Protection Program, the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program, and the Shuttered Venue Operators Grant Program. These expansions helped the smallest businesses—especially in rural areas—that were still hurting from the pandemic try to get back on their feet, keep workers on the payroll, keep their doors open.

Democrats have always made it a priority to help folks who need it most. This kind of relief is vital for keeping the heart of America's economy alive.

For a lot of people, it is the late-night diner that serves up the best cup of coffee in the country before the morning work shift begins or the local cobbler, who knows exactly how you like your work boots to be resoled, or the plumber you can call any time of the night to fix a leaking pipe.

All of these small businesses started with a dream, a desire to make things better, to help people. I know the heartbreak COVID-19 brought on a lot of our small businesses and people all across America—local staples that bring so much vibrance and life to our communities.

However, in the face of a nationwide tragedy, our small businesses didn't throw in the towel and call it quits. Instead, they got creative, like Midtown Bistro turning an outdoor space into a new way to safely reach their community. Our small businesses continued to provide vital services that helped our economy and kept it afloat through these really tough times. For that, I just want to say thank you to all of them.

This Chamber must continue supporting the countless small businesses that keep our economy and our country moving forward. Senate Democrats will continue pushing for expanded opportunities for small businesses to access the capital and credit they need to start or expand businesses, which will, in turn, get more Americans back on the job, create more opportunities and more successful ventures.

One big hurdle that keeps small businesses from unlocking their full potential is not being connected to affordable, high-speed internet to create a website and access the online economy.

I am very proud to have been part of the team and a family that is going to make that possible for people all across the country. There are many ways we can work together, but I am very proud of my colleagues, of what I have learned, and, again, I thank our chairman for leading the conversation in that committee and driving home policies so that we can act to make a difference in the lives of those who have invested in and started small businesses.

We can do more and we can do better, but I am very proud of how we have been able to get things done that make a benefit in people's lives today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I want to thank Senator LUJÁN for his leadership on behalf of small businesses.

Senator LUJÁN is absolutely right. There are a lot of areas that are not necessarily within the jurisdiction of the Small Business Committee that directly affect small businesses, and one of those is access to broadband. Senator LUJÁN understands that for small businesses to succeed, they have to have access to affordable, high-speed internet.

And Senator LUJÁN has also been critically important in so many of the other areas—challenges that we have confronted, particularly during COVID. So I just want to thank him for his leadership on behalf of small businesses and the people of New Mexico.

We are joined on the floor by Senator ROSEN, and I just want everyone to know of her valuable contributions to the Small Business Committee. She has been one of the leaders during these 2 years with the record I just went over of accomplishments under the Biden administration. But she is a real leader in recognizing that, if we

are going to succeed with women entrepreneurs, we need to deal with childcare, and, today, small business tools are not fully available to small business operators of childcare. Senator ROSEN is our leader in trying to make sure that we correct that and do something about it.

I also appreciate her knowledge and understanding and leadership on the regulatory challenges that small businesses confront and taking on that challenge to see whether we can't provide some relief.

So I just really wanted to acknowledge her extraordinary work on behalf of small businesses in this country.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, well, I want to thank Senator CARDIN for his leadership on small business. For the 4 years I have been here, he has been a friend and a mentor, and he has really encouraged me in so many ways to find my voice for Nevada, for this country, and I appreciate his leadership. Thank you.

And the Senator is right. Small businesses, well, they are the engine of the U.S. economy. They foster innovation. They create jobs. They provide a lifeline for families.

And, in Nevada, small businesses make up 99 percent of all businesses. Our small business economy, it is thriving. It is increasingly diverse, allowing many Nevadans to achieve the American dream by being entrepreneurs and providing for their families.

These businesses, they are crucial for Nevada's economy. We should encourage and support them by making it easier to start and operate small businesses, increasing access to capital to help them grow and succeed, and cutting through that redtape that is far too often a barrier.

So here in this Chamber, we must focus on helping small businesses overcome the enormous challenges that they face and the obstacles they experience just to get off the ground.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, my top priorities have been expanding resources in support for Nevada's small business—the owners, the employers, and their workers. And so from introducing a bipartisan bill to help those graduating from minority-serving institutions to open a business to sponsoring bipartisan legislation to help veterans start small businesses in underserved communities, to urging the Small Business Administration to open a Veterans Business Outreach Center in Nevada, I have been fighting for businesses time and time again, and I will keep fighting.

I am also working in a bipartisan way to make small, nonprofit childcare providers eligible for Federal resources so that they can grow, create jobs, and provide more affordable childcare options in all of our communities. And this just means so much to our fami-

lies. It gives them so much peace of mind.

And I am going to continue, as well, to advocate to open up Federal loans for State-legal cannabis small businesses. They are job creators in our State and in a growing number of States across the country.

And we can also help our small businesses by reducing the burden that entrepreneurs face, well, when they get started. The exhaustive hoops that American entrepreneurs have to frequently jump through—from obtaining permits to fulfilling licensing requirements—well, it can be a real challenge for people just to get those businesses off the ground.

And so that is why I am proud to announce that, today, I am introducing bipartisan legislation to help small businesses by cutting through the bureaucratic redtape that often prevents them from getting off the ground.

My legislation would create a centralized website. This website, entrepreneurs can come and visit to get all the information they need from the Small Business Administration on Federal, State, and local licensing and business permitting requirements, with information and resources all in one place, because I believe we should be making it easier to start a small business, and we must make sure that entrepreneurs are in the best position to succeed right from the beginning. And having them going to a one-stop website, that is a start because I know that when we invest in our small businesses and our entrepreneurs, when we invest in our communities, when we invest in our hard-working families, well, together, we create a successful future for our State and for our country.

And so I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in cutting redtape, bringing down those barriers, and increasing information access for all of our small businesses.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, again, I want to thank Senator ROSEN for her leadership, and we certainly are looking forward to taking up the legislation that she has introduced.

H.J. RES. 27

Madam President, I know we are on debate on the waters of the United States.

The rule provides for exceptions for ranchers and farmers. I would hope that we reject the resolution.

I would like to start my statement of support for a strong definition of "waters of the United States" with a reflection on the history of the Clean Water Act.

Congress overhauled the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, originally enacted in 1948, with amendments in 1972 that gave the act its current dimensions. The 1972 legislation spelled out ambitious programs for water quality improvement that industries and municipalities are still implementing today.

The 92nd Congress held a series of votes on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which would later come to be known as the Clean Water Act. The Senate passed the bill, which came out of a conference committee with the House after 39 meetings, by a vote of 74 to 0. The House passed the bill by a 366-to-11 vote.

Nineteen-seventy two was a Presidential election year. Despite a first term notable for its landmark environmental achievements, President Nixon vetoed the bill in an attempt to set himself apart from his opponent, George McGovern.

Bipartisan majorities in both the House and Senate overrode President Nixon's veto, and the bill became law on October 18, 1972. The Senate vote was overwhelming. Meanwhile, State and local leaders, as well as advocates of all stripes, were central in the push for this legislation to be enshrined in law.

Contrast this show of congressional unity with our situation today, where we are relying on President Biden for his veto if the Senate passes this joint resolution of disapproval of the rule the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—jointly submitted relating to “Revised Definition of ‘waters of the United States.’”

The rule under attack finally delivers a clear, workable definition. On December 30, 2022, the Agencies announced the final “Revised Definition of ‘waters of the United States.’” rule. On January 18, 2023, the rule was published in the Federal Register.

The Agencies' final rule establishes a clear and reasonable definition of “waters of the United States” and reduces the uncertainty from constantly changing regulatory definitions that has harmed communities and our Nation's waters.

This commonsense, science-based approach recognizes that pollution upstream can have downstream impacts, so we must protect the system to safeguard downstream communities and our environment. The rule also maintains longstanding Clean Water Act permitting exemptions for routine farming and ranching activities.

The rule ought to be durable in part because it was informed by extensive public comment to establish a definition that supports public health, environmental protection, agricultural activity, and economic growth. In developing the proposed rule, EPA and the army reviewed and considered the extensive feedback and recommendations the Agencies received from States, Tribal governments, local governments, and stakeholders through consultations, meetings, and webinars.

In 2017, Chairman CARPER and I led 19 Senators in a letter to then-EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt opposing the Trump administration EPA's plan to repeal the 2015 Clean Water Rule, which would have weakened safeguards for the Nation's waterways.

Last year, on February 28, 2022, 13 Senators joined me in a letter to the EPA applauding the rule to revise the definition of “waters of the United States.” Our letter explained how the rule takes significant and positive steps toward restoring strong clean water protections that are critical to meeting the Biden administration's commitment to environmental justice.

Clean water is essential for improving public health outcomes through the provision of safe, affordable drinking water for all Americans, no matter their location.

In the interim, I led a bicameral letter with my Chesapeake Bay watershed colleagues to Michael Regan, who is currently the EPA Administrator, and to Lieutenant General Scott Spellman, the Chief of Engineers and Commanding General of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

We urged them to rescind the harmful Navigable Waters Protection Rule the Trump administration implemented, and replace it with a rule that restores strong Clean Water Act protections to the Chesapeake Bay and other waterways and wetlands across the country.

The Bay receives half of its water from a network of 110,000 streams and 1.7 million acres of wetlands, most of which are non-navigable tributaries and non-tidal wetlands that drain to those tributaries. Scientific research attests to the critical importance of small headwater streams in removing pollution from higher-order streams and rivers, and in preserving aquatic and riparian life throughout the entire system.

Small streams and wetlands do not just provide habitat for wildlife and trout and other fisheries that enhance outdoor recreation opportunities; they also clean water for farmers that drive our economy through the production of food.

Water pollution has never respected political boundaries. Using the Congressional Review Act to attack this thoughtfully crafted rule would be a mistake for healthy watersheds and clean water supplies across the country.

I urge all my colleagues to reject this damaging resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I rise today in support of the joint resolution for congressional disapproval striking down the President's revised definitions of waters of the United States.

As a fifth-generation farmer, I know how hard-working Kansas farmers work daily to protect our environment and conserve our precious resources. Farmers serve as our land's original and best stewards. We all want to leave this world cleaner, healthier, and safer than we found it.

Since coming to Congress, we have worked hard alongside our farmers and ranchers and rural landowners to en-

sure our waters become cleaner and healthier and, at the same time, protect our land and water from aggressive government overreach.

This includes working with the previous administration to roll back purposeless, “one size fits all” Federal WOTUS regulations that drive up the cost of doing business for Kansans and are detrimental to their ability to care for their crops and livestock.

As Kansas farmers, ranchers, businesses, and even municipalities know all too well, the Obama-era definition of WOTUS in 2015 dramatically expanded the Federal Government's reach with minimal improvements in water quality.

Today, this White House's reckless expansion of the WOTUS rule only adds more regulations, more redtape, and costs to everyday life in Kansas. This level of Federal overreach is harmful and ill-advised.

It is important to note that my colleagues and I requested the administration suspend the rulemaking until the Supreme Court completes its consideration of *Sackett v. EPA*. This would allow Congress to craft a lawful, predictable, and reasonable rule.

But this request has fallen on deaf ears. Moving forward with this rule is the administration's attempt to revive the Obama-era WOTUS rule, which was rightfully blocked in nearly half of the United States due to litigation in courts across the country.

Now, as the saying goes, history repeats itself, and a Federal judge recently blocked the implementation of the brandnew rule in Texas and Idaho.

Now, back home, my farmers are already bracing for the impact. In fact, I heard from one organization that said:

Farmers and ranchers should not have to hire a team of lawyers and consultants to determine how we can farm our land.

And I agree.

Kansan after Kansan I have met with on this issue has told me this administration didn't consider their input on the new WOTUS definition, further proof of the clear disconnect between DC bureaucrats and the hard-working farmers and ranchers who provide our Nation's food.

Agriculture, oil and gas, energy, the housing industry, road builders, bridge builders, construction workers, and municipalities have all voiced their disapproval of the rule and the costs of the negative impacts that its adoption will have on American industries and consumers.

It seems this administration only listens to radical environmentalists rather than the hard-working, pragmatic voices of the people who love the land which has been handed down from generation to generation, just like in my family—people who care every bit about the environment as any soul on Capitol Hill does. These are the same people who feed, fuel, and clothe America.

This rule is the Biden administration's attempt to federalize our waters

and take control of our private land and leave our producers with more questions than answers, more costs than gain.

In fact—get this—mitigation costs related to the current White House WOTUS may cost farmers and ranchers over \$100,000 per acre. The value of this land itself might be \$1,000, \$2,000, maybe \$5,000 an acre, but mitigation will cost us \$100,000 per acre.

Let me ask a couple of simple questions: Should a dry creek that only has water run through it during a rain be a waters of the United States?

Should plays in western Kansas be a waters of the United States?

Should ditches draining into a dry creek bed be a waters of the United States?

Should water trickling off the terraces my grandfathers built 50-some years ago to prevent soil erosion and the tall lush grassy waterway that is home to pheasants and quail and turkey and deer and rabbits—should this be a waters of the United States?

Under President Biden's rule, the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineer will attempt to answer these questions on a case-by-case basis, meaning that the answer and the cost might change every time. That is no way to do business.

In a time of economic uncertainty, this unpredictable, ambiguous rule-making will amplify the efforts of inflation felt by ag producers and American consumers. No American industry would be safe from the impending rising costs, all while the Biden WOTUS rule fails to achieve the goal of improved water quality.

The regulated community spent the better part of the last decade trying to operate under several different definitions of "waters of the United States." We cannot allow the Biden administration to take us backward yet again.

Farmers and other ag producers are the original stewards of the land, and we all have a special interest in protecting the quality of our Nation's waters. Consistent and clear guidelines and regulations are key to such protections. We cannot keep moving the proverbial goalpost.

The Biden administration's failure to understand the ramifications of this is alarming. As Members of Congress, we must ensure agricultural producers and other stakeholders have the regulatory certainty to take care of our Nation's land and water resources, the lands and waters that we love, the lands and waters that we are leaving to the next generation—to my children and to my grandchildren.

I, therefore, urge the support of the Joint Resolution for Congressional Disapproval, striking down this administration's revised definition of "waters of the United States."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I believe I have 15 minutes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not an order for time.

Mr. CARPER. I would ask that I be granted 15 minutes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 27, a Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove the Biden administration's rule defining the "waters of the United States," or WOTUS, as it is popularly known.

To many Americans, the definition of the "waters of the United States" may not seem like a controversial matter. To understand why it is, though, we need to first ask ourselves, how did we get here to this point?

Well, a little more than 50 years ago, Congress came together to pass the Clean Water Act. In doing so, Congress affirmed our Nation's commitment to protecting and restoring waterways from industrial pollution. Until that point, our Nation's waters—which were and continue to be critical to our health, to our environment, and our economy—were subject to indiscriminate pollution and destruction. Polluters could dump their waste into upstream waters without consequence.

In fact, some of you may recall that the Cuyahoga River in Northern Ohio was so polluted that it caught fire in 1969, not far from where I went to college as a Navy ROTC midshipman during the Vietnam war. The memory of that fire remains with me still today.

When Congress passed the Clean Water Act, there was no confusion—no confusion or uncertainty—about what it was seeking to protect. At the time, there was broad bipartisan concern over the health of our Nation's waters. There was also consensus that we needed to fix a very real and a very costly problem. America's waters needed once again to be drinkable; they needed to be swimmable; and they needed to be fishable.

During the Senate debate on the Clean Water Act all those years ago, Democrats and Republicans alike spoke in support of the legislation. Senator Ed Muskie, a Democrat from Maine and the bill's lead sponsor said:

[T]he rivers of this country serve as little more than sewers to the seas. Wastes from cities and towns, from farms and forests, from mining and manufacturing, foul the streams, poison the estuaries, threaten the life of the ocean depths. The danger to health, the environmental damage, the economic loss can be anywhere.

That is his quote from all those years ago.

Senator Howard Baker, if you recall, a Republican from Tennessee who was also a Republican leader in this body for a number of years had these words to say:

[T]he economy of this Nation can absorb the costs of cleaning up pollution without inflation or without a loss in economic productivity.

He went on to say these words:

If we cannot swim in our lakes and rivers, if we cannot breathe the air God has given us, what other comforts can life offer us?

Senator Baker's words were true then, and they ring true still today. Thanks to the Clean Water Act, our Nation's waters are remarkably cleaner than they were five decades ago. The same Cuyahoga River that caught fire all those years ago is now cleaned up and home to more than 60 species of fish.

The simple fact is the Clean Water Act remains our best tool to safeguard our nation's waters from persistent pollution, protecting our health, protecting our environment. We cannot afford to turn back the clock on these protections for our Nation's waters and those who depend on them.

In a nutshell, that is why I support President Biden's commonsense rule defining which of our Nation's waters need to be protected under the law. It is also why I oppose—what I believe to be—a misguided Congressional Review Act resolution to invalidate it.

After multiple administrations' failed attempts to create a lasting WOTUS definition, the 2023 Biden rule represents—what I believe—is a fair balance. The rule protects our Nation's waters and wetlands and provides flexibility for those who need it. And that last "and" is important—and provides flexibility for those who need it. And, particularly, the Biden rule thoughtfully responds to many concerns that the agricultural community in my State and in other States have voiced over the years.

In fact, the Biden rule makes agricultural exemptions clearer and more consistent with other existing regulations. For example, the rule includes express exemptions for farming on land designated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as prior converted cropland, an exemption long-sought by the agriculture community in my State and, I suspect, in most of the other 49 States. According to the American Farm Bureau, there are approximately 53 million acres of prior converted cropland in the United States—that is 53 million acres of farmland that the Biden rule makes clear should not be regulated—should not be regulated—53 million—million with an "M."

If the CRA resolution of disapproval were to become law, it would overturn this important clarification for agricultural activities under the Biden rule, including the one I just mentioned. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers would also be prohibited from developing substantially similar regulations in the future. All of this would lead to confusion and uncertainty from our farmers and ranchers. We don't need more uncertainty; we need less.

Many of our colleagues who oppose the Biden rule say they prefer the Trump administration's so-called Navigable Waters Protection Rule. I would like to remind them that the Trump rule actually earned its name, I think, for good reason—Trump's dirty water rule was vacated not just by one court but by multiple courts. I think at least

two Federal courts vacated that rule. These court rulings found that the Trump rule failed to fulfill the requirements of the Clean Water Act. Overturning the Biden rule will not bring the Trump rule back.

I will say that again. Overturning the Biden rule will not bring the Trump rule back. The courts have already spoken—not once, but twice—with respect to the Trump rule.

Instead, all that this CRA would accomplish is to create a new phase of litigation and even more uncertainty, neither of which we need. We have also heard some of our colleagues argue that protecting streams and wetlands under the Clean Water Act is an overreach. The science, however, is abundantly clear. The health of our waterways is inextricably linked to our streams and to our wetlands. As we all know, wetlands are valuable for our economy, our environment, and our planet.

So how is that, you might ask? How is that? Well, wetlands protect our communities from dangerous and costly flooding. One acre of wetlands can store up to 1.5 million gallons of floodwater. In total, that means that wetlands in the United States provide \$2.9 trillion in value just by reducing and delaying floods. That is more than the GDP of every State and territory in 2022, except maybe for California. It is also worth noting that nonflood plain wetlands buffer floodwaters by capturing runoff during storms.

So when I hear the criticisms that the Biden WOTUS rule is bad for our economy, put plainly, I could not disagree more. Some may say that our Nation cannot afford the level of protection for our waterways and wetlands provided by the Biden rule. As it turns out, the converse is true: We cannot afford not to protect it.

The reality is that because of the interconnectedness of our waterways, streams, wetlands, oceans, and estuaries, how private property owners manage their land has the potential to affect us all. If your upstream neighbor pollutes the water or drains a wetland, that can impact your property too. Similarly, what one State does can impact neighboring States as well as States even further downstream.

May I add one other thing? The Clean Water Act reminds us of the moral obligation all of us have to follow the Golden Rule: to treat others the way we want to be treated. The Biden rule requires us to be good neighbors and stewards of our planet, while also providing flexibility for those who need it. I, for one, am grateful for that.

As the late Senator Baker put it more than 50 years ago, right here on this very floor, he said.

[I] have found that the kind of natural environment we bequeath to our children and grandchildren is of paramount importance.

Those words were true then, and they are even more true today.

So let me say this again: The planet that we bequeath to our children and

the planet that we bequeath to our grandchildren is of paramount importance to them, and it is also to us as their parents and their grandparents. With that thought in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.J. Res. 27.

Madam President, I was coming down on the train today and thought about a visit I paid to a farm probably about a half dozen years ago. It was a beautiful day like today, and we had farmers—scores of farmers who were there. It was organized, I believe, by the Delaware Farm Bureau.

We had people from the administration, the Senate Democratic administration, who had come. And they had come to listen, to hear from the farmers that were gathered, their concerns with an earlier version of this rule, the waters of the United States rule. And the farmers, among other things, said: We want some certainty. We want some predictability, and we want you to listen to us. We want you to listen to our thoughts, and we want you to make sure that the next time you write something like this, you take our thoughts into consideration.

I don't have time in the short time that has been allotted to me to go chapter and verse about the words that were spoken by farmers in my State on that day, but the words that have been spoken by farmers all over this country in the weeks and months since then have been taken into effect, and simply saying that they have been ignored is just not true. It is just not true.

Changes have been made, and they are reflected in the document that we are going to be voting on here in a bit—reflected in the good work that has been done by this administration.

How much time do I have left, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You could speak as long as you like.

Mr. CARPER. That could be scary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I'm sorry. The vote is in 15 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I think we have another Senator from West Virginia that is ready to speak over here.

I want to just close with this. The U.S. Department of Agriculture stands ready to work with farmers and ranchers to assist them with compliance. I will say that again: The U.S. Department of Agriculture stands ready to stand with farmers and ranchers to assist them with compliance.

Finally, I think this is a moderate rule that thoughtfully responds to the concerns of farmers and ranchers. I met with Administrator Regan personally. This is not the Trump rule, and this is not the Obama rule. It is a compromise, and I think it is one that deserves to be supported.

So I would ask for a vote that is against the measure that is before us today.

I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I want to thank the chair for presenting his side of the argument.

Now I think we are going to hear the other side of the argument on why taking this rule down will pass today—because of the strong opposition to it.

Today, we are going to have the opportunity to bring a divided Congress together, united in rejecting misguided and unnecessary overreach by the executive branch.

In its attempt to regulate basically anything and everything, the Biden administration, once again, overstepped its boundaries in the Waters of the United States rule, or WOTUS, as we have heard, and they did this this past December. It is the third major change in 8 years. The chairman talked about all of the uncertainty. This is the third change in 8 years to the definition of what "waters" are and what is a subject of Federal jurisdiction. With this comes more uncertainty, more redtape, and more government for millions of Americans.

It is clear we need to take action in the face of this burdensome rule, and it is exactly why I have introduced the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that we are about to vote on. So let's take a look at the new rule issued by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers.

President Biden's new WOTUS rule repeals the 2020 navigable waters protection rule that provided predictability and certainty for our farmers, our ranchers, our miners, our infrastructure workers, our homebuilders, and our landowners such that they can rely on. That 2020 waters rule properly implemented the Clean Water Act by protecting America's waterways through coordination and cooperation between the States and the Federal Government. Who knows their States better than the State regulators?

This new definition, however, drastically expands Federal jurisdiction over streams, wetlands, and private property at the expense of the States and their citizens. It also adopts a subjective "significant nexus" test for determining what is and isn't subject to Federal regulation under the Clean Water Act, up to and including dry ditches—it doesn't sound like a navigable water to me—that could fill with rain during a storm event even in the middle of the desert.

To sum it up, the Biden administration's WOTUS rule tells States and individuals that the Federal Government knows best. It is true to form for this administration so we shouldn't be too surprised.

It is also important to note that this is all happening while there is a pending court case at the Supreme Court, right now, that will make many of these same determinations, but they couldn't wait. Of course, they couldn't wait. They had to grow the Federal Government's authority and redesignate waters that had never been designated before.

So let's take a look at the impacts this WOTUS rule would have on farmers and on small businesses.

There are 17,000 small businesses in the small State of West Virginia that will be impacted by this rule and our own ability to build in the future. We should be setting predictable, reliable policy for America's farmers and ranchers. Instead, under the Biden WOTUS rule, if I am a rancher in Arizona or a cattle farmer in Montana or own a family farm in West Virginia, I will literally have less control over my own land. Previously converted cropland and even irrigation ditches may now require a permit under this new regulation.

The American Farm Bureau says:

Farmers and ranchers should not have to hire a team of lawyers and consultants to determine how we can farm our land.

Do you know what will happen? They won't hire the team of lawyers. They just won't farm their own farmland. Yes, that is what millions fear from this new "waters of the United States" definition.

The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture says that this rule will "significantly increase the regulatory burdens and create further uncertainty for state departments of agriculture, farmers, and ranchers across the country."

Along with those who live and work in rural America, this rule will target employers of all sizes across our country as well. The National Federation of Independent Business writes that the Biden WOTUS rule will "make compliance a nightmare for small businesses," adding, "If there was ever a time to not impose additional burdensome regulations, that time is now."

Often the cornerstone of our communities, small businesses need policies that support, not penalize them.

Our Nation's future depends on our ability to build. That includes transportation, infrastructure, and energy projects of all kinds. President Biden knows that our Nation's broken permitting process threatens to undercut some of our own shared legislative accomplishments on infrastructure investment.

Yet, at a time when we should be streamlining our Nation's permitting and review process, the Biden waters rule makes things worse. It comes at a time when we are trying to build here in America. It will require more people and more projects to seek more Federal permits, which is time and money and doesn't improve the environmental oversight. The environmental oversight is there, but it will cause fear that the EPA will take enforcement action at any given moment with eye-popping fines.

The Associated Builders and Contractors writes that the Biden WOTUS rule will "cause building delays due to regulatory uncertainty, plus increased permitting and mitigation costs, which will make it more difficult and expensive to grow food, produce energy and

build critical infrastructure for the 21st century."

We have heard our Nation's farmers, small businesses, and our builders loud and clear: President Biden's waters rule is bad policy at an even worse time.

Now, I have been asked what a Congressional Review Act resolution would do, and during a recent Environment and Public Works hearing, this issue came up.

If approved by both Houses of Congress and signed into law, this resolution would overturn the overreaching and expansive WOTUS rule issued in December and return to a narrower and more practical definition that was put in place prior to 2015. You may hear that this will leave waters unprotected. That is simply not true. The regulatory authority for waters that are not navigable nor travel interstate will be returned to the States as Congress intended in the Clean Water Act.

Importantly, my resolution would prevent a substantially similar and overbroad definition from being written again. It would not prevent the EPA and Army Corps from issuing a narrower replacement rule that actually is common sense and addresses stakeholders' and elected officials' concerns and seeks to clarify the status quo.

As you have just heard, States and the regulated community, including farmers and ranchers, have been very clear in their conclusion, and I agree: The Biden final rule on WOTUS is a significant expansion—not a narrowing—of Washington's role in regulating land and waters across the country, and it creates more uncertainty than it cures.

The expansion of Federal authority and the encroachment on States' rights and private lands is the precise reason we have seen overwhelming support for my CRA resolution.

When I introduced this resolution of disapproval, I was proud to do so with our friends and counterparts in the House of Representatives. Led by House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chair SAM GRAVES, the House passed this measure with bipartisan support, including nine Democrat votes. It is important to note that two of these Democrat votes came from the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee and the ranking member of the House Appropriations' Agriculture Subcommittee. These are folks who know the needs of our farmers and rural Americans very, very well and who bravely put the best policy forward ahead of partisan politics. So I thank them for their support in this effort.

It demonstrates, again, that it isn't about party; it is not about party lines. It is about standing up to the needs of those who live and work in rural America. Well, we can stand by them today. We can also give a boost to our future transportation, infrastructure, and energy projects of all kinds across our country.

With this resolution, we are sending a clear message that Congress, even a divided Congress, will defend working Americans in the face of Executive overreach.

With that, I appreciate the support we have received in our effort to place this important check on Executive overreach, and I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on my resolution of disapproval.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 27

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the joint resolution is considered read the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The yeas and nays have been previously requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hagerty	Rosen
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	Moran	Tuberville
Cruz	Mullin	Vance
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Ricketts	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Carper	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Casey	Hirono
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Kaine
Booker	Durbin	Kelly
Brown	Gillibrand	King
Cantwell	Hassan	Klobuchar
Cardin	Heinrich	Lujan

Markey	Reed	Warner
Menendez	Sanders	Warnock
Merkley	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Welch
Murray	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Ossoff	Smith	Wyden
Padilla	Stabenow	
Peters	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Fetterman
Feinstein	McConnell

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Nebraska.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. RICKETTS. Madam President, I rise today humbled and honored to stand in this Chamber to represent the people of the great State of Nebraska.

The first time I walked into this Chamber, I got chills. This Chamber represents the hopes and dreams and aspirations of the American people; it represents the shared values we have had for nearly two-and-a-half centuries; it represents just how exceptional our Republic, how exceptional America is.

Today, it is all too easy to take for granted just how exceptional our great Nation is. Our Founders threw off the tyranny of a King with an idea. It was a really radical idea that our rights come to us directly from God, not from a King, and that governments were instituted to protect those rights. It was a brandnew idea that our rights are ours; that they are endowments from God, not consent from some government.

Even today, after 246 years, our founding principles are just as true. These values—like the rule of law, checks and balances, federalism—they are critical to our Republic. We are strongest when we follow them, and we are never weaker than when we stray from them.

We are also strong because of our Constitution. Our Constitution—forging a government of the people, by the people, for the people—is the greatest governing document ever written.

The primary purpose of our government is to secure people's liberty and happiness, their peace and prosperity, and we have done it really, really well for nearly two-and-a-half centuries. This is incredibly rare. We have created a bubble in world history. For most of human history, people have worried that somebody bigger than them would come and take their stuff or a foreign army would rampage across the landscape, burning down everything—not here in America.

Another advantage of our system is that it unleashes the power of individuals' unbounded potential. In America, it doesn't matter where you start; with enough grit and hard work, you can go anywhere. That is why the world wants to come here. That is why they send their best and brightest students to study and train here. That is why nearly every major innovation and breakthrough comes from America. That is why so many have sought a better life

in our great Nation. Through our strength, we remain the cornerstone of global peace and prosperity.

Our greatness is also reflected in our commitment to defend freedom here in this building, in our courts, and even on battlefields. It requires much of us as patriots and citizens, and if we are not vigilant, it could easily slip away. To paraphrase Ronald Reagan, freedom is only one generation away from extinction. We don't pass it on to our children in the bloodstream; it must be fought for each and every day.

We must not lose sight of the things that make America so exceptional. That is our commitment to our God-given liberties.

Our Founders were concerned that as government got too big, it would tend toward tyranny and rob people of their freedoms. Here in the Senate, if we continue allowing the Federal Government to grow too big and too intrusive, we risk our peace and prosperity; we risk losing the very values that have always made America great. However, if we hold on to those founding principles, we have a path to an even brighter future for this great Nation.

The Framers of our Constitution believed that government closest to the people is best able to serve them. This is common sense. What works in Nebraska may not work in New York. That is why we have the 10th Amendment to the Constitution—that the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are reserved for the States and the American people. That is why top-down Federal mandates usually do more harm than good.

In my home State of Nebraska, we have shown America what is possible when the Federal Government gets out of the way and allows States to lead. We have proven that limited and responsive government works best.

During my time as Governor, we kept the size and scope of government small. We empowered people. We ran government more like a business. The reality is, when government works better, people are served better. We dramatically improved the level of services that we provided to Nebraska families. We got help to people in need faster than ever before. For example, we reduced the on-hold time for people calling our economic assistance phone line by 75 percent. We made it easier for citizens and businesses to work with the State. As an example, we cut the time it takes to issue a permit by nearly in half.

We achieved millions of dollars in savings while doing so. And do you know what saving money allows you to do? It allows you to give back to people their tax dollars in the form of tax relief. We provided billions of dollars in tax relief, including to our veterans and our seniors, by phasing out the taxes on their retirement income and Social Security.

We attracted new investments and jobs for communities big and small. We employed a record number of Nebras-

kans, and our unemployment rate fell to a historic low.

We made government work better. We proved that we can do a better job of providing services while controlling our costs. We also proved that we can respect people's freedoms and liberties while keeping people safe. During the pandemic, we kept kids in classrooms, people at their jobs, and government open. And we were ranked the No. 1 best pandemic response State.

All of this reflects our conservative Nebraska values. In Nebraska, we respect people's freedom. We value strong communities, family, and faith. We honor our law enforcement and our military. We expect a limited, accountable government. We believe in personal accountability and responsibility and the incredible potential of the individual. Nebraska is what America is supposed to be.

But, nationally, we have strayed from these values. Too many take our freedom for granted. Too many focus not on what is good but on their grievances. Too often, we hear resentment rather than reverence for the very principles that made this a great Nation. Too many have forgotten the old adage that a government big enough to give you everything you want is strong enough to take everything you have.

Massive and reckless spending to fund bigger programs has seriously weakened our economy. Families and businesses are struggling under the burden of high taxes, high inflation, and rising interest rates. A wave of job-killing regulations from Washington is harming American agriculture and industry.

At the same time, the Federal Government is failing in many of its most basic responsibilities, like keeping us safe. Undeniably, national security is paramount to the Nation's freedom and prosperity. It is the Federal Government's most important responsibility, but the Biden administration has turned a blind eye to the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border.

Vulnerable people are dying, victims of the cartels. Fentanyl and other dangerous drugs are flooding into our Nation. So are suspects on our terrorist watch list. And what comes across the border, whether it is the drugs, the criminals, or the human trafficking victims, they don't stay there. They impact every community. It is costing Americans their lives.

Taryn Lee Griffin was a 24-year-old mom of two when she died in Lincoln, NB, of a drug overdose. She was out with friends when she took a pill she thought was a prescription drug. It was laced with a lethal dose of fentanyl. Her mom, Liz, said: Our daughter is everyone's daughter. She is right.

Our sons and daughters, our friends and neighbors, they are paying the price for this crisis with their lives every day. It is shameful and unacceptable.

This administration's incompetence on the southern border is matched by

its foreign policy blunders. The disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan projected weakness to our friends and adversaries, and American servicemembers lost their lives, including Nebraskan Cpl Daegan Page.

Unbelievably, we left Americans behind and abandoned our Afghani security partners. Our allies are seriously questioning our commitment to our friends.

And, even worse, the bad guys, our adversaries—like the Chinese Communist Party, regimes in Russia, Iran, and North Korea—they are questioning our resolve.

Our freedoms and way of life depend upon peace. How do we maintain peace? We maintain peace through strength.

Not for the first time in our history, we find ourselves at a pivotal moment, facing what Ronald Reagan termed “a time of choosing.” I believe the choice is clear. We must chart a path to greater freedom and strength. We must remain the world’s beacon of peace and prosperity.

It requires us to get back to basics, back to our founding values. Those values have guided me as Governor, and they will guide me here. As Governor, we spent 8 years delivering on excellence.

I didn’t believe the naysayers back then when I started, and I don’t believe them now.

Government can work better, and it can do so while respecting our liberties. That is the goal I will work toward each and every day. I will strive to make the Federal Government work better for the people of this country. I will reject every effort to restrict our liberties and undermine our values.

I will work to restore transparency and faith in the Federal Government, and I will work to control spending, curb unnecessary regulation, and limit the size and scope of government. I will work to secure our borders and provide the resources to defend ourselves against our enemies. I will work to assure that we have a well-trained, well-led, and well-equipped military to defend us.

I will hold this administration and future administrations accountable to the people of Nebraska, and I will always fight for the best interests and freedoms of the Nebraskans I serve.

In spite of the challenges we face, I believe there has never been a better time to be an American. However, many don’t feel this way. We must make the American dream real for them.

Throughout history, we have risen to meet every challenge. With our founding values as our guide, we will again rise to meet the challenge of this moment.

My experience in the Senate so far has reaffirmed my faith that we have more in common than divides us. With that joy and faith in our Nation, I ask God to continue to bless the great State of Nebraska and the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I am so happy to be joined in the U.S. Senate by a Nebraska colleague as sharp, as capable, and as ready to get to work as Senator RICKETTS.

As Senator RICKETTS noted, Nebraska is what America is supposed to be. I know Senator RICKETTS cares deeply about the people of our great State and that together we will work hard to deliver results for Nebraska. Senator RICKETTS served Nebraska admirably as our Governor for two terms, and I am confident that his time in the U.S. Senate will further his legacy as an exceptional advocate for our State.

Just this month, Senator RICKETTS and I collaborated by traveling to the southern border to see firsthand the crisis that is unfolding there. We have partnered on a number of bills to push back on the Biden administration’s bureaucratic overreach, including on WOTUS, and we held a tele-townhall for our constituents.

I congratulate Senator RICKETTS on his maiden speech here in the U.S. Senate, and I look forward to many more opportunities to work together toward the interest of our home State of Nebraska.

I congratulate the Senator and welcome him to the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I want to welcome the Senator. We get to add another plain-spoken Nebraskan to the U.S. Senate—people who bring a commonsense, clear-eyed realism, a solutions-oriented approach to the Senate. We are really grateful to have former Governor, now-Senator, PETE RICKETTS join the U.S. Senate, along with his colleague Senator DEB FISCHER. That is a powerful, powerful duo and will be a great partnership for the State of Nebraska and make great contributions to the U.S. Senate and to the betterment of our country.

And I know that, like a lot of people from their region of the world, they understand—as he pointed out in his remarks—the importance of a strong and secure America, an America that projects strength in the world, not just militarily but economically, diplomatically.

And so as we work on these issues, we face lots of challenges, lots of dangers in the world today.

I am just delighted to have another U.S. Senator who comes to us with a record of accomplishments as a Governor. He got a lot of things done when he was Governor of Nebraska. And, as a neighbor State, a State that gets an opportunity to observe—and, actually, I share almost a border with Senator FISCHER, because my hometown and her home area are literally, just as we speak, as the crow flies, in Nebraska and the Dakotas, a few miles apart.

But we know that we are going to have two people here representing that

State whom I have been able to watch, not only from afar but now up close, and just know how talented they are, how dedicated they are, and, again, just how practical and realistic and commonsensical they are about the challenges facing our country and about the solutions that we need to put in place to meet those challenges.

So congratulations on your remarks and welcome. It is great to have you here, and we look forward to serving with you, Senator RICKETTS, and to continue to serve with Senator FISHER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Louisiana.

CRIME

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, with me today is Mr. Seth Brazier, who is one of my colleagues in my Senate office.

Madam President, I want to talk about my city today, the city of New Orleans. The city of New Orleans is iconic, and the whole world knows it.

My first job in State government was with a reform Governor, back in the late 1980s, named Governor Buddy Roemer.

Japan was doing extraordinarily well at that time economically, making many foreign investments, and Governor Roemer traveled to Japan to try to convince Japan to invest in Louisiana. And when the Governor got back, he told me: Kennedy, my first meeting was very enlightening.

He said: In my first meeting, I met with about 50 Japanese business people.

He said: I asked them how many of you have been to Louisiana?

The Governor said three of them raised their hand.

He said: Then I asked them another question. I asked these 50 Japanese business people: How many of you have been in New Orleans?

He said: Twenty-five of them raised their hand.

The city of New Orleans is iconic. Every State, every country would love to have a New Orleans. Our city was founded over 300 years ago. We are one of the oldest in America. It was founded in 1718. Our city is envied for—let’s see—our food, our music, our architecture, our diversity, our dialects, our merriment, and our festivals—for our celebration of life. In New Orleans, we dance with or without music.

But New Orleans is under attack. People there are being murdered. They are being shot. They are being raped. They are being stabbed. Their stuff is being stolen, and our quality of life is being degraded because of crime—because of crime, a cancer on our city.

I want to give you a sense of the breadth of our problem. In 2022, we had 280 murders in New Orleans. The victims ranged from six months of age to 91 years old. Ten percent of these victims were under the age of 18. Seventy percent were people of color.

Listen to this. One out of every eight Black males who live in New Orleans between the age of 15 to 24 will be shot—one out of eight. Statistically, it

is more dangerous to be young and Black in New Orleans than it was to be a marine in the battle of Fallujah during the height of the insurgency in Iraq. Those are the numbers.

Last year, my city had the highest murder rate in the country, twice the murder rate of Atlanta—twice. We had the most murders since 1996. Our murder rate was up 141 percent since 2019, and it is not just murder. Shootings in 2022 were up 88 percent from 2019, carjackings up 156 percent, armed robberies up 20 percent, and it is not much better in 2023.

Now, behind these sterile statistics are real live human beings, flesh and bones, blood and tissue.

In one of the most appalling cases that we have had, about a year ago, in an area in New Orleans that we call Mid-City, four teenagers—a 17-year-old boy, a 16-year-old girl, and two 15-year-old girls—four teenagers, carjacked a 73-year-old grandmother.

The teenagers pulled the grandmother out of the car and drove away, but the grandmother's arm got tangled in the driver's seatbelt. The teenagers kept going. They dragged her for a block until her arm was severed. This lady bled to death at the scene.

Crime in New Orleans is affecting all of us in our city—residents, visitors—every part of our city, but no one is hit harder than our low-income communities. That is true both in terms of public safety, and it is also true economically.

Most poor people are not criminals. They are not. But criminals often prey on our lower income fellow citizens, particularly in their own communities. Existing businesses then leave and they take jobs with them and unemployment goes up and we have more poverty.

And those businesses that remain in our lower income communities—they are often mom-and-pop shops with a small margin of profit—they have to pay more for insurance; they have to pay more for security; they have to pay more for credit, so they have to raise their prices, and that makes people even poorer.

That is what crime does.

We have tried—we in New Orleans, we have tried everything. We have around 900 police officers—we need 2,000—because many of our police officers retire every day.

We have tried paying higher salaries. We have tried paying better benefits. We have tried curfews. We have tried task forces. We have tried social programs. We have tried afterschool programs. We have tried crime cameras. We have tried facial recognition. We have tried conflict management. We have tried mentoring. We have tried youth clubs. We have tried job training. We have tried enhanced educational opportunities. We have tried prosecuting juveniles as adults. We have tried hotspot policing. We have tried 12-hour shifts. We have tried hiring administrative personnel to take

the paper workload off our cops to get them back on the street. You name it, and we have tried it.

We have tried everything but one thing—stop and frisk. Stop and frisk. Under the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, a police officer may stop a suspect on the street without probable cause, and that police officer can stop that person on the street without probable cause so long as that police officer has what is called reasonable suspicion to believe that the person stopped has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime.

And after that person is stopped, if the police officer has reasonable suspicion to believe the person stopped might be carrying a weapon, the police officer can pat down that person on the outside of his or her clothing. That is called stop and frisk. It is a very effective law enforcement practice. It is used by police officers every day in virtually every city all across America, and it has been used since 1968.

In 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court decided a case—a very famous case—called *Terry v. Ohio*. *Terry v. Ohio*. The very liberal Chief Justice—I don't use the word "liberal" in a pejorative sense. I am just describing him as many scholarly works have. The very liberal Chief Justice Earl Warren actually wrote the opinion in *Terry v. Ohio*, and he was joined in that opinion by Justices Hugo Black, John Harlan, William Brennan, Potter Stewart, Byron White, Abe Fortas, and Thurgood Marshall. They all said together: Here is our opinion, *Terry v. Ohio*.

And what did that opinion say? That opinion said that under appropriate circumstances, stop and frisk is permissible. It is perfectly constitutional under the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Now, I want you to note that a police officer cannot stop and frisk somebody on a whim, on a hunch. A cop does not have unfettered discretion.

In order for a police officer to stop a person on the street, that police officer—let me say it again—must have reasonable suspicion—reasonable suspicion—to believe that the person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime.

And once again, once the person is stopped, the cop can frisk that person on the outside of his clothing—called a pat-down—only if the cop has reasonable suspicion to believe that the person stopped is carrying a weapon.

Why does this cop have this authority? To protect the cop during the questioning.

Reasonable suspicion is not a hunch. It is not a whim. It is an objective standard. It is not probable cause. You have to have probable cause to make an arrest, to conduct a search, for example, of someone's home. Probable cause is a higher standard, but reasonable suspicion is an objective standard. Reasonable suspicion exists, according to the case law, as you know, *Madam President*—reasonable suspicion exists

when an objectively reasonable police officer, given the facts and circumstances of that particular situation and considering the cop's training and experience, would suspect that a person, as I have said, has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime. And if probable cause is then established, of course, the person can be arrested.

Every cop in America who goes through training academy—and every cop in America does. Every cop in America knows about stop and frisk. Every cop in America is trained in the law enforcement practice of stop and frisk.

Let me give you an example: Let's suppose a police officer is driving by and he sees an individual late at night walking along the street with a coat hanger or a slim jim—do you all know what a slim jim is? It is sometimes called a lookout tool. It is a way to get into a car if you have lost your keys.

If a police officer sees someone late at night walking down the street with a coat hanger or a slim jim looking in cars, the police officer can stop that person. Can he arrest that person? No, he does not have probable cause. No crime has been committed, but he has reasonable suspicion to stop and talk to that person.

And once he stops to talk to that person, if he sees a big bulge here in his top pocket, he may have reasonable suspicion to believe that person has a weapon, and it would be dangerous for him, the police officer, to keep talking to that person. So the police officer—he can't make him take his jacket off or anything. He can just pat him down to see if there is a weapon.

Now, I repeat: Cops all over America stop and frisk suspects every single day, and they have for 50 years.

And you know who endorses it? The U.S. Supreme Court.

Now, like all police practices, it can be abused. Stop and frisk can be abused. And when it is, it can be and it should be challenged in court, and the abusing officer should be held accountable. But most officers don't abuse it.

As many people know, Mayors Rudy Giuliani and Michael Bloomberg—two New York mayors back-to-back—used stop and frisk extensively during the crimewave of the 1990s and the early part of this century to fight crime and gun violence in New York City. We have all read about that. Crime fell dramatically. Now, some have said that is due, in part, to stop and frisk. Some have said that stop and frisk had nothing to do with it. Some have said that in some cases, the New York Police Department abused stop and frisk, and those who maintain that position said that too often police officers were stopping and frisking people on the basis not of reasonable suspicion but on the basis of race or national origin. And that is wrong.

A case was filed called *Floyd v. City of New York*. *Floyd v. City of New York*. It was a class action. It was filed

against New York Mayor Bloomberg and others, alleging that the NYPD was not stopping people on the basis of reasonable suspicion but on the basis of race and national origin.

The Federal district court in that case ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. The NYPD then set about the business of reforming its stop and frisk policy, but Mayor Bloomberg left office, Mayor Bill de Blasio became mayor, and for all practical purposes, he completely stopped the practice of the stop and frisk.

So stop and frisk can be abused, and it is important to establish practices and procedures to guard against that abuse.

But let me put this another way. This is how I look at it. Some cops may have violated the legal requirements for a proper Terry v. Ohio stop and frisk. And when that happens, that may make that person a racist or at least guilty of committing a racist act. But that does not mean that the practice of stop and frisk is inherently racist. Because some knuckleheads abuse it does not mean that the practice is inherently racist.

In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court, with only one dissent, has said that, properly applied, it does not violate the Constitution of the United States and can be an effective law enforcement tool.

So when there is abuse, the abuse is on the cop. It is on the officer. And most officers don't abuse stop and frisk.

And if it is proven he did something wrong, he should be held accountable. The time has come. The time has come for my city of New Orleans to try stop and frisk. It is time.

Now, some of our public officials in New Orleans are going to probably disagree with me, and some are going to say: Well, we are using stop and frisk already.

They are. Every now and then. Sometimes. But if you go talk to the average cop on the street in the city of New Orleans—I have; I have talked to many of them—they are going to tell you: The people with the flags in their offices—the politicians and the big shots and the political hierarchy—they are discouraging us from using stop and frisk. They don't want us to use stop and frisk.

I think it is time. We tried everything else, Lord knows. It is time to allow the men and women of the New Orleans Police Department to use stop and frisk without fear of losing their jobs.

I do not believe that the New Orleans Police Department is racist. Let me say it again: I do not believe that the New Orleans Police Department is racist, systemically or otherwise. I do not believe that the average New Orleans Police Department police officer is racist. My God, the NOPD is 58 percent Black and people of color and 35 percent White.

Now, we have a Federal consent decree in New Orleans for our police de-

partment. It is between the U.S. Department of Justice and the city of New Orleans. It oversees the New Orleans Police Department or, as we call it, NOPD. It was signed and entered into by Mayor Mitch Landrieu in 2010.

The consent decree does not prohibit stop and frisk. In fact, the consent decree provides for stop and frisk. I want to quote from the consent decree:

NOPD officers may only conduct investigatory stops or detentions where the officer has reasonable suspicion that a person has been, is, or is about to be engaged in the commission of a crime.

Does that sound familiar?

That is right out of Terry v. Ohio, where the U.S. Supreme Court almost unanimously said stop and frisk, when used appropriately, is a very effective law enforcement tool.

Now, the consent decree goes on—wildly, in my opinion. It mandates a stop-and-search data collection and review procedure. So the consent decree says, if you are going to use stop and frisk, you have got to collect all the data.

I think that is a great idea.

The consent decree also requires the police officer, when he or she uses stop and frisk, to document the stop and frisk and detail the reasonable suspicion in writing—in writing. In New York, they call this report a UF-250 form. I don't know what it is called in New Orleans. They have been using stop and frisk so infrequently, I am not sure they have one. But it requires the cop who does the stop and frisk to sit down and say: Here is the suspect. I had reasonable suspicion, and here, with specificity, is why. And let me say, collecting the data and requiring the reporting after the fact is standard operating procedure. This is nothing new. It is standard operating procedure in every police department in America. It is also common sense.

There is a gentleman in New Orleans by the name of Mr. Ronald Serpas. Mr. Serpas is a former superintendent. We call our chief of police at NOPD a superintendent. He is a former NOPD superintendent. Mr. Serpas is also a former chief of the Washington State Patrol, and he is now a professor of, I think, criminology at Loyola University in New Orleans.

I don't speak for the superintendent, and I don't want to intend to. But he has written a number of articles in support of stop and frisk in New Orleans.

He has said that the NOPD today has been reduced to only responding and reacting after a crime has been committed, when the damage has been done. The former superintendent says: What we need in New Orleans is more proactive policing to prevent crime, like stop and frisk.

Now, the former superintendent has analyzed the publicly available data on the NOPD consent decree. We collect data on our consent decree. It is publicly available. In fact, the city council has put up a dashboard for the consent decree, and one of the provisions in the

dashboard has a stop-and-search feature. You can go on the stop-and-search feature on the internet and see how many stops and frisks the police department has done in the past 180 days. So you have a date, and it looks back 180 days.

This is what the former superintendent found after he analyzed the stop-and-search feature on the website. And I will give you an example; I don't know if I was clear about the 180 days.

For example, January 2, 2015, on that day, if you went back 180 days, the NOPD had conducted 32,913 stops in the prior 180 days.

Let me say that again: January 2, 2015—8 years ago—in 180 days prior, the NOPD had conducted 33,000 stops.

As of January 18, 2023, 8 years later—really 7, because it is January—NOPD had conducted 5,095—let's call it 5,000 stops over the past 180 days. So 5,000, down from 33,000; and that 5,000 is spread over 6 months. Do you see a trend here?

Now, during COVID, as you would expect, stops and frisks in New Orleans were down. People were inside. Following COVID, the stops increased—according to the superintendent who analyzed the data—increased to 14,303 in the 180 days before August 17, 2021.

So think back to August of 2021, over the prior 6 months, the NOPD did 14,303 stops. But after that day, there was an uninterrupted decline in the number of stops, down to 5,095 today.

So the stops are up here. They came down. They went down further because of COVID. They went up to 14,000 in August of 2021, and then they kept going down. That doesn't exactly, but it closely tracks crime rate in New Orleans, because stop and frisk is used to proactively prevent crime.

Look, I want you to understand. The problem in New Orleans—I love my city. I love my State. I love my city too. The problem in New Orleans is—I don't want you to think that we have thousands of previously law-abiding New Orleanians turning to crime. That is not what is going on. We don't have a bunch of law-abiding people who have now turned to crime in my city. That is not what is happening.

The problem we have is with career criminals. And they are running rampant, and our cops are spread thin. And we have some public officials—not all of them but there are some—that think cops are a bigger problem than criminals. And they think that criminals really shouldn't be prosecuted—they are not bad; they are just sick. This is America. You can believe what you want, but that is what is going on in my city. It is not a majority, but it is more than a handful.

We tried everything. We need to allow police officers to stop and frisk. We need to allow our police officers to stop and frisk. It should be carefully monitored. It should be done legally. But it should be done. We have tried everything else, everything under the sun, to stop the extreme recidivists.

Nothing has worked. And maybe this perfectly legal, very effective police practice, stop and frisk, which is used every day across America, will help.

I yield the floor to my colleague from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from New Hampshire.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 33, H.J. Res. 7, and that at 5:45 p.m. today it be considered read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution without any intervening action or debate.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ARIEL MARSHALL

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I now get to the reason that I came to the floor today, which is to recognize and express appreciation for a member of my staff, my legislative director, Dr. Ariel Marshall. Ariel will be leaving for a new opportunity next month, and I can't let her go without thanking her for her service and sharing how much she has meant to me, to her colleagues, and to the State of New Hampshire over the past 8 years. And all you have to do is look at all of our staff from our DC office who are here on the floor as part of this recognition of Ariel.

Ariel came to my Senate office in 2015 through a congressional fellowship for scientists and engineers with an interest in public policy. As a chemist with a Ph.D. in hand, Ariel approached policymaking as if it were a research topic or an experiment. She asked questions. She identified problems. She dove into research to understand different subjects and issue areas and their relationship to one another. She formed theories based on her observations. She looked for creative ways to test her ideas and analyze her findings, and she eagerly shared her conclusions with her colleagues and with an open mind on how the process could be improved.

With her background, it is no surprise that Ariel quickly developed a reputation as a capable and friendly team player. As her fellowship came to an end, Ariel made the decision to stay on staff as a legislative assistant with a focus on energy and environmental issues.

Her responsibilities grew in a very short time when she became a senior domestic policy adviser. And when the legislative director position opened on my team, Ariel was a natural fit, and she accepted her new leadership role with her trademark positivity, grace, and good humor.

Over the last 8 years, there have been historic moments that I know will be the cornerstone of Ariel's memories in the Senate. At the top of that list—for me, anyway—is Ariel's success in getting the Shaheen-Portman—Portman-Shaheen energy efficiency bill across the finish line and signed into law.

Her steady, unwavering efforts to move that bill forward, year after year, piece by piece, should be taught to every incoming legislative staffer in the Senate. It is a study in perseverance and effectiveness.

Her work on Shaheen-Portman—and the work of others before her—is making a huge difference in the global fight against climate change.

Ariel was also instrumental during one of the most difficult, most intense, and most important crises this body has had to face—the fight against COVID. Ariel led our legislative team at a time of great uncertainty here in the Senate. She was a key negotiator of the Senate's legislative response, including the historic CARES Act. Ariel's work on that bill, particularly on the small business provisions and the PPP program—in the midst of a nationwide pandemic and a potential economic collapse—helped to save millions of jobs around the country. Her efforts kept workers employed and food on the table for countless concerned families across this country.

Finally, Ariel was also our leading negotiator throughout the bipartisan infrastructure debate during the summer and fall of 2021. Ariel was particularly integral to both the water infrastructure and broadband investments, and she spent countless late nights—and had numerous slices of cold pizza—with me, with Senator COLLINS, and with the other bipartisan members of that group.

The infrastructure bill is a huge legislative achievement. It is one that will bring countless benefits to Americans for years to come. One of its most important accomplishments was proving that Republicans and Democrats could still work together to get big things done even in this difficult political climate. This would not have happened without the work of people like Ariel, who is tough, patient, effective, and focused on making a difference.

I am proud of all of the legislative work we have accomplished over these last 8 years in my office, and Ariel's leadership has been integral to these successes.

The legislation, the negotiating, the policymaking—that is just one measure of Ariel's impact. With her background in research and chemistry, Ariel knows that it is a community, or a team, that finds innovations and

makes discoveries. That much is clear in her leadership of our legislative staff. She has shaped a team that approaches issues and problems just as she would: by asking the right questions, by searching for solutions, by evaluating all of the options, by getting the job done.

All who work with Ariel view her not only as a wealth of knowledge but also as a dear colleague, a sympathetic ear, and a treasured friend. The relationships she has built and the values she has instilled in her team—I think that is an equal part of her legacy and long tenure on my staff.

These last few weeks have been bittersweet because, while all of us are excited about what is ahead for Ariel, we will also miss her wisdom, her counsel, her can-do attitude, her humor, and her infectious laugh.

Thank you, Ariel, for giving so much to me, to your colleagues, to New Hampshire, and to the country during your service in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ENERGY

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the importance of unleashing American energy, the consequences of President Biden's refusal to invest in American energy, the impact this is having on energy States like West Virginia and Texas, and what steps we can take to move forward to fix the mistakes made by the White House and the jeopardy that they have put our country in.

President Biden has made his stance on American energy clear since day one of his administration. As President, his policies and personnel choices have delivered on his campaign promises, and high prices are just part of the bargain. The administration has canceled pipelines, rescinded previously issued approvals for others, and raised barriers to building new ones. They have frozen oil and gas leasing and proposed raising royalties—costs that will be passed on to the consumer. The Biden EPA has continued to layer regulation on regulation, though I am pleased to report that, earlier today, through the congressional resolution, we pulled down the WOTUS rule that the EPA recently put forward last December.

These are just a few of the unreasonable and misguided policy decisions this administration has made that have led to what we are facing today.

Congressional Democrats have not been shy about their stance on an “all of the above” energy future. Look no further than the two pieces of legislation that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle boast about the most—the American Rescue Plan and the so-called Inflation Reduction Act. Just last week, while I was questioning President Biden's head of the Environmental Protection Agency, I was asking him about his Agency's budget. Administrator Regan admitted that, because of the Inflation Reduction Act,

coal capacity and natural gas generation will plummet in the future.

This is the coal capacity with the IRA. It is way down here below 50. If there had been no IRA, it would have been somewhere here, around 80.

Let me say that again.

Through data generated by the EPA and admitted to be true by the head of the administration, coal capacity and natural gas generation will be significantly lower in our country because of the Inflation Reduction Act.

Here is natural gas with no IRA, up here. With the IRA, it will be way down here by 2040.

He went even further—Administrator Regan did—and admitted the misguided policies with the Inflation Reduction Act will lead to the closures of coal and natural gas plants. This will lead to the shuttering of proud energy-producing communities across my State of West Virginia and our country, moving us further away from the energy independence that we desperately need and want. This clearly spells out the priorities of this President and underscores the urgency needed in reversing these policies.

On top of all of this, the out-of-control reckless spending and Green New Deal priorities that are packaged in the American Rescue Plan have caused energy prices to soar alongside record inflation. So let's take a look at the consequences of President Biden's war on American energy by the numbers.

When he took office, the average price for a gallon of gasoline was \$2.39. Now the average price is \$3.44—a 44-percent increase. And let's not forget what we just lived through 9 months ago when the record was set, when gas prices averaged about \$5 a gallon for the first time in history.

High gas costs like this just create a domino effect. In fact, increased fuel costs and shortages have made it more expensive to manufacture goods, to deliver goods, and, ultimately, to provide what we want and need in this country. It has made everything more expensive. This creates additional strain on our supply chains and feeds into the inflation that so many families continue to struggle with.

Think about the cost of food at the grocery store. Add to this the price that Americans paid to heat their homes when winter came on. No matter what utility you used, it went up. Whether it was natural gas, electric, oil, or renewables, all prices went up. Those who heat their homes with natural gas are at the highest disadvantage in paying 25 percent extra this winter just to keep their homes warm. This truly shows that, no matter what, there is no escaping the consequences that President Biden and congressional Democrats have created by turning their heads on American energy.

The good news is we know what we need to do to unleash American energy and move critical projects forward. Republicans and Democrats alike know it. We all know it. We must make gen-

uine reforms to our Nation's permitting and environmental review processes. For example, it should not take 7 to 10 years to permit a mine or a large transportation project in the United States. It should not be typical for endless legal challenges to be filed, one after another, for the sole purpose of postponing and, ultimately, killing key energy projects. Projects that create jobs, that produce energy of all kinds, and that drive down costs should not be delayed or stopped because of burdensome regulations. The current system hamstring States and employers that are trying to build anything here in the United States, and it needs to change.

We need to provide regulatory certainty to our States. We need to expedite permitting and review processes while ensuring all environmental considerations are completed. We need to codify substantive environmental regulatory reforms and jump-start key projects like, in my State, the critically important Mountain Valley Pipeline.

Together, we should address section 401 of the Clean Water Act. We should streamline the NEPA process with real deadlines for Agency reviews, and we should limit judicial review to avoid endless litigation that delays and sometimes cancels projects.

I want to be very clear when I say "projects." I mean projects of any kind. That means both renewable and conventional sources of energy.

We have made great strides in advancing cleaner energy sources, but without the ability to build and build quickly, we will not capitalize on that process.

Unfortunately, at every turn, the Biden administration has made it harder for any of these projects to move forward. I mentioned earlier the waters of the United States rule, the WOTUS rule. It significantly expands the Federal Government's authority when it comes to water sources across the country, and it will mean more people will have to get more permits and deal with more redtape—many times, on their own private farmland.

Fortunately, we challenged that rule through a Congressional Review Act, and it passed in a bipartisan way in both the House and the Senate, and it will go to the President's desk. It is up to him.

Have you listened to the voices of the American people or will you continue with these tactics that you have been doing?

So what do we need to do? Why do we need to do it? How do we get it done?

I have been saying all along that I believe the best solutions are by going through regular order—bipartisan, through our committees—through the Environment and Public Works Committee, through the Energy Committee—and through any other committee that has relevant actions toward permitting. It is where we can hear those who know these issues the

best. We can formulate solutions, hash out our differences, and compromise. I believe that is the only way that we can get permitting reform across the line, and I am willing to do whatever I can.

I am glad the House is taking the first swing at this and sending us a great starting point for how we can finally address America's broken permitting process and give a boost to energy production right here at home. There is no denying there is growing momentum in the Senate to get real, legitimate permitting reform across the finish line and signed into law. I have had many, many conversations.

I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to heed the increased call for energy independence and help us deliver that "all of the above" solution, which we all say we want, that increases our national security, creates jobs, keeps good jobs at home, and that, lastly and very importantly, lowers the energy costs for American families.

With that, I am proud to be here with my fellow Republican Senators who have the solutions to energy independence.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues today, the esteemed Senator from West Virginia and the senior Senator from Texas, to talk about the importance of producing more energy in America, which means that we have got to find a way to press back against the Biden administration's harmful policies that have caused energy prices to increase and have fueled inflation across our entire economy.

Gas prices, today, are \$3.46 nationally. That is the average—\$3.46 nationally. It has gone up 45 percent since President Biden took office. It is almost a 50-percent increase. That means everyone out there, every day, is paying 50 percent more at the pump. And it is not just that. It is the impact on inflation. There is an energy component in every good and every service that people buy. With a 50-percent increase in the price of gas at the pump, think about what that means. That is a 50-percent increase in energy cost in terms of inflation, which is hitting Americans so hard right now. Residential electricity prices spiked 25 percent during the same period. With natural gas, the price is up more than 50 percent—more than 50 percent.

What is causing this? Clearly, it is the Biden administration's policies. They spent the last 2 years restricting and curtailing U.S. energy production in pursuit of this Green New Deal, starting with day 1 when President Biden came into office with his canceling the Keystone XL Pipeline, and it has continued with the moratorium that he put on Federal oil and gas leases shortly thereafter.

President Biden, the Biden administration, along with Members of Congress, the Democrat Members of Congress, then passed a partisan bill that levied \$735 billion in new taxes, including a new tax on natural gas and higher fees and royalty rates on Federal energy production.

So they not only put a moratorium in place on oil and gas production on Federal lands but then later came back and said, OK, they will start allowing some production, but only 20 percent of those Federal lands are available, and the Biden administration increased the royalty rates by 50 percent. When you restrict supply and raise the cost, of course that is going to raise the price of energy in this country, and it is going to reduce the supply.

Now the Biden administration is doubling down with an onslaught of regulatory overreach specifically designed to make American energy production more expensive. This includes the waters of the United States regulation. The waters of the United States rule absolutely impacts everybody across this country. It is a fundamental property rights issue. Again, it affects not only our production of energy but ag products and everything else.

It makes no sense that while energy prices are high, instead of embracing America's energy producers, President Biden has drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to its lowest level in 40 years while going to the Middle East and places like Venezuela for our energy. Think about it. Think about their record on environmental stewardship. Think about their record on human rights. Instead of producing more energy here at home, they are going to places like Venezuela and allowing them to export their energy to the United States.

The Biden administration should not turn to places like Iran and Venezuela for more oil—countries with little to no environmental standards—when we have the capability to ramp up production here in this country.

In 2019, the United States produced 13 million barrels of oil per day, including 1.5 million barrels per day from my State, North Dakota.

U.S. oil production remains down at about 12.1 million barrels per day, so that is 1 million barrels a day less than when the administration came into office—1 million barrels a day. For example, in our State, we are producing a little over 1 million barrels a day when we were at 1.5 million barrels a day at the beginning of the Biden administration.

Increasing the supply and lowering the cost of energy is key to attacking inflation. As I said earlier, the cost of energy is built into every other good and service consumed across this country. To this end, I have introduced some legislation to expand our domestic energy production and enhance the energy security of the United States and our allies.

The North American Energy Act brings certainty to the permitting

process for important cross-border energy pipeline and electric transmission line projects and prevents the President from taking unilateral action to cancel vital energy projects like the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Projects Act streamlines the review process for interstate natural gas pipelines and LNG projects, helping to more efficiently deliver natural gas to areas that need it the most.

More pipelines are needed to deliver natural gas to areas, including New England.

I say to the Presiding Officer, in your State, we need pipelines up there. There are still people up there who use fuel oil rather than natural gas because we don't have the pipeline capacity up there to bring it to them. That obviously increases their costs. Again, going back to environmental standards, it is clearly advantageous if they were to utilize natural gas.

The Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act is the third act I would mention that I have put forth that improves the permitting process in States like North Dakota and others where you have split mineral estates, where the Federal Government has no surface acreage, but the minerals underneath the land is in some cases owned by the Federal Government, in some cases owned by private individuals and others, and they are held up from producing those minerals because of the Federal ownership even when the Federal Government doesn't own any of the surface acres.

Removing this duplicative requirement for a Federal drilling permit in these cases would empower private mineral holders to develop their resources and produce more energy, while enabling the Federal Agencies, like BLM, to actually better utilize their resources.

These three commonsense permitting reforms are included in H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Cost Act, which is currently being considered on the House floor, H.R. 1.

It is time for us to go to work on a bipartisan basis in this Chamber, take the handcuffs off our energy producers, and produce more energy here at home for American consumers in this country.

The United States is fortunate to have abundant and affordable reserves in coal, oil, and gas. These resources are one of our Nation's greatest strengths. It is an incredible asset.

Nobody has better environmental stewardship than our country in producing energy. Thanks to the shale revolution, the United States became the world's largest oil and gas producer, and we have been able to do it while simultaneously reducing emissions. The carbon capture technologies we are advancing are actually reducing emissions.

Once again, by encouraging domestic production by streamlining energy

project approvals to get energy to market, we can unleash America's full energy potential to increase supply and bring down costs for hard-working families.

I now will yield the floor to my colleague from the Lone Star State, who can speak on these issues as well.

We are absolutely committed to producing more energy for hard-working Americans to bring down inflation and also because it is such a vital component of our national security. Energy security is national security.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to thank our friends from North Dakota, from West Virginia, and from Nebraska for being here today to talk about producing low-cost energy, which would reduce emissions.

I am from an energy-producing State. In Texas, we are an "all of the above" State. We actually generate more electricity from wind than any other State in the Nation.

While I know many people think of the Lone Star State as being primarily an oil and gas producer, which we are, we really are an "all of the above" State because we found that, for example, when the wind doesn't blow and the Sun doesn't shine, then you need a baseload from some source, whether it is nuclear, whether it is natural gas. We have even had instances where, because of very, very cold weather, 100-year cold snaps, even natural gas does not supply that baseload. But here again, it is a reminder of how vulnerable we all are to a secure and affordable energy supply.

If we needed a recent historical reminder, when Mr. Putin invaded Ukraine and threatened to cut off the sole source of energy for essentially all of Europe, they had to scramble for alternative sources and diversify their energy supply. That ought to be a lesson to us that we should not put all of our eggs in one basket, but we should pursue an "all of the above" energy strategy.

One of the biggest hurdles to energy development in America today, whether it is fossil fuels or green energy, is the permitting process. Any project with a Federal nexus, whether it touches Federal land, crosses State lines, or uses Federal funding, has to wade through a swamp of redtape. This process is not just cumbersome, it is also time-consuming and expensive. On average, it takes 4½ years to complete the environmental review for potential projects. Again, that is just the average—4½ years. Many projects take longer. In fact, it takes more than 6 years to complete the environmental review for a quarter of the projects.

Whether we are talking about drilling for oil and gas, building wind farms, mining critical minerals, building pipelines, or any other energy project, the permitting process is a major impediment. It puts the boot on

the neck of America's energy producers; it raises costs for consumers, who need more, not less, energy; and it delays the jobs and investment that these projects would create.

Earlier this week, a coalition of more than 340 organizations sent a letter to Congress advocating for commonsense permitting reform. This group includes organizations that represent traditional energy producers, like the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association, but it also notably includes renewable energy groups, such as the American Clean Power Association and the American Council on Renewable Energy. It includes industries that are supported by American energy production, like pipeline contractors, builders, truckers, and engineers, as well as groups that advocate for small businesses and consumers. This is a very diverse range of stakeholders, and they agree on this one thing: It is time to fix America's broken permitting system. They described it as "the biggest obstacle to building the infrastructure of the future," and I agree.

I know that sometimes people think that building things is going to encourage more fossil fuel production, but the simple fact is, the same transmission lines that carry electricity from wind-generated turbines—you need those for any type of electricity, whether it is nuclear power, whether it is natural gas, whether it is wind. All of these require certain basic infrastructure, and they are all slowed down and made more expensive by the antiquated permitting process. This problem harms American energy security and stands in the way of new jobs and investments in communities all across the country.

It is time—it is really past time—for Congress to simplify and expedite the permitting process. This is at the top of the to-do list for our Republican colleagues in the House. As we have heard this week, they are expected to pass a package of bills to overhaul the broken permitting process and make other reforms to boost energy production and bring down energy costs for consumers.

Unfortunately, the majority leader, the Senator from New York, didn't waste any time attacking the House bill. He called it a "partisan, dead-on-arrival, and unserious proposal." That is hardly the recipe for productive, bipartisan negotiations between the House and the Senate.

As the majority leader knows, Senator MANCHIN, the Senator from West Virginia—his permitting reform didn't have the votes to pass the Senate, let alone the House. But the good news is that Senator MANCHIN and Senator CAPITO—both from the great State of West Virginia—are leading the efforts in this Chamber to work on a bipartisan permitting reform bill.

The only way to fix the broken system is to work together, to utilize our committees, and to craft a bill that can gain the requisite support of at least 60 Senators.

As a top Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CAPITO has been on point on this issue. She and Senator BARRASSO, who is the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, are our leaders in trying to find a way to fix this broken process and promote America's energy security.

As I said, there is strong bipartisan support for commonsense permitting reform, and I hope the majority leader will not stand in the way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

CONSUMER AND FUEL RETAILER CHOICE ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, my colleagues and I are here today to discuss the importance of unleashing American energy. Especially during a time of international turmoil, we in the United States need to ensure that we reduce our dependence on unstable foreign countries for our energy.

But right now, as the Senator from Texas alluded to in his comments, there is a tangled web of unnecessary regulations that is holding our Nation back from an "all of the above" energy agenda that would benefit consumers, producers, and our national security.

One example of what is holding us back is outdated regulation of E15. Nebraska is an energy-producing State and has an important role in any discussion about unleashing American energy. E15 is a biofuel blend of gasoline with 15 percent ethanol. This critical fuel mix is proven to lower gas prices for consumers at the pump. One study found that the average price of E15 during last year's summer driving season was 16 cents less per gallon than regular unleaded gas.

As any driver can tell you, after years of escalating gas prices under this administration, these savings add up quickly. Consumers want the lower fuel prices of E15, and retailers know it. That is why the number of retailers offering E15 has more than doubled since 2017, rising from 1,200 to 2,700.

E15 boosts our domestic energy security. Our country is blessed with ample natural resources, and we should take advantage of them—including ethanol. Use of E15 unleashes American energy here at home, dealing a blow to our dependence on foreign oil.

And ethanol is good for the environment. Emissions from ethanol are 46 percent lower than from traditional gasoline. One study found that corn ethanol contributed to a reduction of 500 million tons in emissions between 2005 and 2019. So why not make use of E15?

This issue is important to my State—very important. Nebraska is the second largest producer of biofuels in the Nation and generates over 2 billion gallons of renewable fuel each year. But when we look at these overly restrictive regulations, they are threatening to rob consumers of that choice.

One outdated law needlessly restricts the sale of E15 during the summer

months. The regulation restricting E15 is based on a measure called the Reid vapor pressure, or the RVP, which measures the volatility of certain gasoline blends. The irony of this is that E15 actually has a lower RVP than E10, which is less restricted. Ultimately, this outdated law doesn't make much sense, and it harms consumers.

In Nebraska, we have 24 operating ethanol plants, and they have created almost 1,500 good-paying jobs across our State. Family farmers in Nebraska use biofuels like E15 to help fuel the rest of this country. For the sake of those Nebraskans, as well as the average American at the pump, I have been leading the charge for many years to end the legal limbo that we see around E15.

This month, I introduced again the Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, which would allow for the year-round, nationwide sale of E15. Eight different States have made admirable strides to allow the sale of E15 in their regions, but these efforts can only result in a patchwork of uneven regulations across the country, leaving many families without access to cheaper E15.

The EPA could—and they should—take emergency action to allow E15 sales this summer. But, let's remember, that would only be a temporary solution. We need a permanent, nationwide solution, and that happens to be what my bill provides. The bill is the opposite of a mandate. It puts consumers in the driver's seat by providing them with the completely voluntary option to take advantage of E15 and its benefits.

We have worked hard to build a very diverse, bipartisan coalition for this bill. The Nation's largest oil and natural gas trade association, the American Petroleum Institute, is one of our bill's most notable supporters. It is time that Congress joins together to pass legislation that truly advances an "all of the above" energy solution, that ensures Americans' access to lower cost E15 fuel.

All of my colleagues should support more choices for lower cost fuel, especially as our country reels from high inflation.

The Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act provides families with the choice to purchase and retailers with the choice to sell E15. That is a major win for family farmers, for consumers at the pump, and for our American security.

Mr. President, I see my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska is here on the floor, and I would yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

H.J. RES. 27

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I rise today to fight a blatant land grab by the Federal Government.

My colleagues and I support the Senator from West Virginia's resolution disapproving of the waters of the United States rule. This rule would change the definition of "navigable

waters” to include things like roadside ditches, puddles on construction sites, farm ponds.

Think about that. President Biden’s EPA and Army Corps of Engineers apparently believe that drainage ditches, construction site puddles, and farm ponds are navigable waters. To say this statement defies all common sense is an understatement. Quite frankly, it is embarrassing.

I am from Nebraska. I get it. I am from a land-locked State. But, to me, “navigable” means you can put a boat on a body of water and go somewhere. But you don’t have to take my word for it. We have the Merriam-Webster definition of “navigable” right here, and it says: “deep enough and wide enough to afford passage to ships.”

If you put a boat on a roadside ditch, you are not going anywhere. If you put a boat on a puddle on a construction site, you are not going anywhere. If you put a boat on a pond, you are just going around the pond. You are not going anywhere besides that.

To Nebraska farmers and ranchers, this is just dumb. Beyond that, the Biden administration is trying to change the law without coming to Congress. The 1972 Clean Water Act said “navigable waters” 50 times. Congress’s intent could not have been more clear.

As a legislative branch, we must protect our authority. The Biden administration is trying to subvert our laws, and it must be stopped. If allowed to stand, this rule would increase costs and uncertainty for producers, property owners, and small businesses.

President Biden and liberal bureaucrats have absolutely no business regulating this, and I think the President knows it. You know why I think the President knows it? Well, because President Biden’s EPA and Army Corps of Engineers quietly finalized this rule on the last working day of the year, just before New Year’s Eve. It seems like the President and his cronies hoped that no one would notice.

Well, guess what. We noticed. Nebraska’s farmers and ranchers noticed. My Senate colleagues and I noticed, and we are pushing back hard. And, today, my colleagues and I are defending private property rights from this unconstitutional power grab. Today, we are sending a message to President Biden that our farmers and ranchers need relief, not regulation. Today, we are fulfilling our responsibility to provide oversight and accountability in response to Executive overreach. Today, we are defending the authority of the legislative branch.

When I was Governor, I repeatedly opposed President Obama’s efforts to expand the waters of the United States rule. As Senator, I strongly oppose President Biden’s attempt to do the same.

I want to again thank Senator CAPITO for her leadership on this issue. I am proud to have joined a bipartisan effort today to vote to rescind this un-

constitutional rule. I hope President Biden will choose to sign this common-sense resolution as he did the DC crime bill. He agreed with a bipartisan group of Senators then, and he should do the same now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 85

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, 4 months ago, the U.S. Senate, and then the U.S. House, came together to ban the app TikTok on all Federal Government devices—on tablets, on phones, on computers—on Federal contractors and their devices as well.

We acted, just a few months ago, with a sense of urgency because we decided that TikTok was a national security threat. A privacy threat? Yes. A data threat? Yes. But above all, a national security threat. And we were right to act just those few months ago.

And now we must take the next step: to ban TikTok nationwide, to protect the security of every single American whose personal lives, whose personal data, whose personal security is in danger from the Chinese Communist Party in Beijing. And it is time to act now because we have seen, just in the last week, the TikTok CEO come before the U.S. Congress and confirm that the reasons we acted 4 months ago were right and valid and that the need at this hour is urgent.

In this last week, we learned—I should say we confirmed from the testimony of the TikTok CEO that TikTok has the ability to track Americans’ data, to track Americans’ location, to track Americans’ personal lives—whether they want it to or not.

What am I talking about? Well, TikTok tracks your keystrokes. Now, think about this for a second. It is not just the videos you may upload if you have the app on your phone. It is not just the videos that you watch. It is the keystrokes that you enter—and not just while you are on the app. Oh, no. It tracks your keystrokes all the time—while you are texting, what you are emailing. It tracks your contact list. It reads your phone list.

We believe, based on independent third-party analysis, that it can get into email. And it does this whether or not the user consents. In fact, there is no way to turn it off. Americans are subject to this ongoing data collection—at all hours of the day and night—even if they have got TikTok turned off on their phone.

What else have we learned? Well, that TikTok is monitoring the location of Americans. It is not just your keystrokes. It is your location data. Where are you right now? What is it that you are doing? Where are you moving to? Are you in a car? Are you in a building? On what floor are you on? TikTok can use the settings of your phone to track exactly where Americans are.

And we know that they have been doing this—TikTok has been gathering

this data—not just on American citizens but also on American journalists. We know that they are able to see what journalists are saying, to see where journalists are going.

New whistleblower revelations have shown that TikTok has spied on particular American journalists and tried to track them, tried to learn what they are writing, tried to control, in essence, or at least get an understanding of what their message might be.

Think about this. An app on your phone that tracks your keystrokes, that reads your personal information, that tracks journalists around, that tracks your location—you can’t do anything about it. And we haven’t even gotten to the worst part.

The worst part is all of this information is accessible to engineers based in China, accessible to the Chinese Communist Party.

When he was asked about this last week, the CEO of TikTok didn’t deny this espionage. No, what he said instead is, well, “I don’t think spying is the right way to describe it.”

Maybe he preferred the word “surveillance.” Maybe he preferred the word “monitoring.” Maybe he preferred the word “tracking.” But I actually think “spying” just about captures it.

The problem with TikTok is not the videos on the app. The problem with TikTok is, it is a backdoor for the Chinese Communist Party into the personal lives and information into the most intimate details of every American’s life.

And we know the link between TikTok and the Chinese Communist Party is real, and we know that it is strong. TikTok is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Chinese parent company ByteDance. We know that ByteDance has Chinese Communist Party members in its senior leadership. In fact, ByteDance’s editor in chief is a Communist Party secretary. We know the Communist Party has done trainings for TikTok and ByteDance personnel. We have video of it being done in Beijing, in China.

Whistleblowers have come forward to my office, and to others, and given us evidence that China-based engineers are able to access Americans’ personal data at any time that they want. Again, the CEO did not deny that last week. No.

The links to the Chinese Communist Party are real, and they are inscribed in Chinese law. This isn’t just a matter of what TikTok may want to do. No. TikTok is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Chinese parent company and is subject to Chinese law, which both the 2014 espionage law in that country and their 2017 national security law, which required—required—the company to turn over data that the Chinese Communist Party, that Beijing, may request. Under those laws, they must make Americans’ data available—must make it available—to Chinese communist officials.

This is in addition to the CCP members who are actually senior officials in these companies, who work in these companies, who have access to Americans' data as I stand here and speak to you today.

The intent of China in all of this is quite clear. They want to build a profile on every single American. We know that many of the recent data hacks of credit agencies, of other digital repositories of Americans' personal information have been carried out by communist China. They are hungry for information about the American people. They are gathering it on everybody that they can, as much as they can—just like they do to their own citizens. And they are using the app TikTok to do it.

Of course, that is not the only way that the Chinese Communist Party has tried to gather information on Americans. This is certainly not the only time that they have done it. Think about the Confucius Institutes all across the country that the CCP funded on America's college campuses. Think about the researchers they funded and tried to place into key programs, key institutes and universities all across the country. Heaven's sake, think about the Chinese spy balloon that just went over this country, right over my home State of Missouri, just a few weeks ago, photographing everything that they could.

Now, this is a pattern. The difference is, in those cases, we addressed it. We shut down the Confucius Institutes. Those who have lied about their money that they have gotten from China, the funding that they have gotten, have in some cases been prosecuted for attempted espionage on America's college campuses, and the spy balloon was belatedly shot down—but shot down, at least.

Now, we have taken action in these other instances to protect Americans to stop the efforts of the CCP to spy on America, to collect Americans' data, to put Americans at risk. And now we must do the same thing with TikTok.

This is why President Trump and the previous administration tried to ban it. Let's not forget this isn't the beginning of this debate. This is the end of it. We have been at this for years now.

Years ago, the last administration tried to ban TikTok for all of these same national security reasons that led us as a Congress to ban it on Federal devices.

This has been a long time coming. There is no rush to judgment here. This is what administration after administration has concluded; that it is time to take action.

Here is the real truth that if it were the Confucius Institutes, the Chinese spy balloon, if it were some American company that was coordinating with a foreign ally, we would shut it down immediately. And we have done it in these other cases. But with TikTok, now TikTok says: Oh, no, no, no, no. You can't do that to us. You can't hold

us accountable. We have a special carve-out. No, we have the First Amendment. The First Amendment protects us.

Well, I must have missed the class in law school where we covered the First Amendment right to spy. The last time I checked my Constitution, there was no such protection. And I can be darn sure that there is no special First Amendment carve-out for communists.

Now, the First Amendment may protect dance videos, sure; upload those all you want. But the First Amendment does not protect the right to spy on American citizens. It does not protect espionage. It does not protect what the Chinese Communist Party is trying to do in harvesting the data of millions of Americans.

Now, TikTok has no special First Amendment carve-out. They don't get special privileges that no other entity or an American company would get. They are subject to the same rules. And when you try to spy on American citizens, when you try to use Americans' own phones as portals for collection, that ought to be stopped. You ought to be banned.

And the fact that they are a China-based company shouldn't help them or hurt them. The fact is, their ties to Beijing, their ties to the CCP, their ongoing efforts at espionage, and their ongoing lies, by the way, to this body—this is a company that has come before this body and lied time and time again. They said that they weren't controlled by ByteDance. Now we know they are. They said that China's China-based engineers couldn't access American user data. Now we know they can.

They said that the CCP had no influence. And yet last week, the CEO of TikTok couldn't even confirm that the CCP hadn't helped write his talking points. Now, this is an entity—this is a corporate interest—that is influenced, if not, controlled, by the Chinese Communist Party.

The national security risks are severe and growing worse. And I haven't even talked about—I haven't even talked about—the materials on suicide promotion that you will find on TikTok. I haven't talked about the risks to mental health that it may pose.

And there is a reason that TikTok isn't even available in China. Did you know that? In China, TikTok isn't available. Why is that? Well, it is because Beijing isn't stupid. They know it is "digital" fentanyl.

TikTok wasn't designed to make our lives better. TikTok is designed to addict and then to be used as a gateway into our personal lives. It is designed to addict and then to be used as a portal to spy on American citizens.

Now, I tell you what, here is one thing that has changed since just December, a few months ago, when we banned TikTok on Federal Government devices. TikTok has gone into full damage control mode. And as Big Tech companies do all the time, they hired a

fleet of lobbyists and have spent untold amounts of cash. I am told that even today TikTok lobbyists have been seen here in the building. I have no doubt that they are scurrying around right now. Maybe they are in the Gallery.

I just say this: We have the opportunity today to send a message to this corporate interest that the U.S. Senate is not for sale; that we cannot be bought; that we cannot be purchased; that we cannot be influenced by their lobbying campaign, by their corporate money; that we will instead side with the American people. We will tell the truth about what this app is. We will do our jobs and protect Americans.

Now, some say that we ought to have a broader bill that would not actually ban TikTok but would give new authority to the executive branch and leave it open. I don't agree with that. My view is, we should act decisively to ban TikTok directly. We shouldn't give new, open-ended authority to Federal bureaucrats; we should target this threat specifically. That is what this bill does that we have before us today. It goes right at the problem. It bans TikTok in this country. It protects the American people, and it sends the message to communist China that you cannot buy us.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 85 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, there are two main reasons why we might not want to do this. The one would be the First Amendment to the Constitution. Speech is protected, whether you like it or not. The second reason would be that the Constitution actually prohibits bills of attainder. You are not allowed to have a specific bill against a person or a company. So this fails on two egregious points, pretty obvious points. I think we ought to think about that.

I think we should be aware of those who peddle fear. I think we should be aware of those who use fear to coax Americans to relinquish our liberties, to regulate and limit our First Amendment rights.

Every accusation of data-gathering that has been attributed to TikTok could also be attributed to domestic big tech companies. In fact, one of the bills they are looking at doing is broad enough that the President will be given the power to designate whatever country he sees fit to be an adversary and whatever company underneath that definition. It would basically be a limitless authority for the President to ban speech.

If Republicans want to continuously lose elections for a generation, they

should pass this bill to ban TikTok, a social media app used by 150 million people, primarily young Americans. This brilliant strategy comes while polls indicate that 71 percent of young women and 53 percent of young men voted for a Democrat candidate for Congress.

Admittedly, many Democrats have joined Republicans in calling for this ban, but, like most issues, the blame will stick to Republicans more.

The Republican strategy to ban TikTok comes simultaneously with GOP complaints of domestic social media companies canceling and censoring conservatives. Without a hint of irony, many of these same conservatives now rail against censorship while advocating for censorship against social media apps they worry are influenced by the Chinese.

Before banning TikTok, these censors might want to discover that China already bans TikTok. Do we really want to emulate Chinese speech bans? Aren't we the ones who say it is wrong for China to ban speech? So we are going to be just like China and ban speech we are afraid of?

The vice president of FreedomWorks, John Tamny, perhaps described this situation best:

Nauseating Harassment of TikTok Presumes Americans Will Be Saved From Chinese Authoritarianism If U.S. Politicians Act Like Chinese Authoritarians.

We are going to be saved from speech if we ban it in our country. My goodness. Could we think of anything more antithetical to the freedom of speech?

Go to the app. They say the app is full of propaganda, and your young people will be dancing into communism. Go to the app and search for Falun Gong, the anti-communist religious sect that is persecuted in China. Go to TikTok and search for videos advocating Taiwan's independence; criticism of Chinese President Xi Jinping. Videos are all over TikTok that are critical of official Chinese positions. That is why TikTok is banned in China. Do we want to follow China's lead in banning speech?

We should not let fear of communism cause us to ignore our First Amendment protections of free speech.

This legislation violates not only the First Amendment rights of those who own TikTok—many of whom are actually Americans, not Chinese—but it also violates the First Amendment rights of the millions of young Americans who use this social media app.

I ask the American people: Do you want Joe Biden to be your censor? Do you want to give unlimited power to any President, regardless of party, to decide who is our adversary and which countries and then which companies? There is not even a list of what percentage. What if the Chinese own 1 percent of a company or 10 percent of a company?

One of the bills before us would allow the Department of Commerce to decide—there are five countries they list

that are adversaries; these are big countries that have a lot of interactions with our country already—decide which country in addition to the five.

The Department of Commerce can designate a country as an adversary, but then they can designate a company. But there are no specifics. Do the new people who are designated to be an adversary have to own 100 percent of the company? 50 percent of the company? 1 percent of the company?

This is a crazy gift of power to one person. I don't care which party they are in; it is a huge mistake.

Doctors Mueller and Farhat of Georgia Tech write:

If nationalist fears about Chinese influence operations lead to a departure from American constitutional principles supporting free and open political discourse, we will have succeeded in undermining our system of government more effectively than any Chinese propaganda.

Throughout the 20th century, millions of people were fed communist propaganda every day for their entire lives. When the regimes collapsed, the people celebrated. They danced on the Berlin Wall and on the grave of communism.

Have faith. Have faith that Americans are smart enough to hear bad ideas and reject those ideas. Have faith that our desire for freedom is strong enough to survive a few dance videos. Have some faith in freedom.

We don't ban things that are unpopular in the United States. Our Constitution even allows a Communist Party.

The previous speaker said, and I quote, "There is no . . . First Amendment carve-out for communists." Well, actually, there is. In our society, you can be a communist. I don't advocate it. I think it is a terrible idea, and almost no Americans choose it. But there is a Communist Party here. We actually had a former CIA Director who said he voted for the Communist candidate in 1976—someone I don't advise you appoint to be the head of your CIA. But this is a free country. You can actually have terrible ideas, and you can broadcast them. That is what freedom of speech is about. It is not about saying: You know, I love Mother Teresa. It is not about saying things uncontroversial. It is about the ability to say things that people don't like.

Have some faith in freedom.

Our Constitution does protect even despicable speech, even the Communist Party. It operates today. Nobody wants to join the Communist Party, but you still can if you wish. America is a country that celebrates free expression, that cherishes free association, that is confident in the cause of liberty.

If you want to address the evils of Big Tech, it is not the Chinese Government you have to fear but your own. In June 2021, Newsweek reported that Big Tech complied with 85 percent of government requests to hand over your personal data. So you are worried

about the Chinese Government? Your government has all of your data, and they are sucking it up from all of Big Tech. So the thing is, is your next step to ban Big Tech in our country?

There are some people who are promoting banning TikTok, and their next step is Facebook. This is on both sides of the aisle. This contagion is infecting the whole country—both parties.

Realize that this means—with 85 percent of government requests to Big Tech being honored, this means that Facebook, Google, Apple, Microsoft, once presented with a subpoena or a warrant, routinely hand over the contents of emails, text messages, photos, documents, calendars, contact lists, and more to your government. Big Tech puts up virtually no legal fight to protect your privacy. They could go to court to stop this. Instead, there is a big cable that runs from Big Tech to the government, and they snoop on every bit of our information. If you want to protect privacy, why don't we start by protecting our own privacy in this country?

To those who are worried that the Chinese Government might somehow now have access to millions of American teenagers' information, realize that all social media sucks up personal data that people voluntarily provide. If you are going to ban TikTok, what is next?

Arguably, several domestic apps censor conservatives more than TikTok. I know this because I have been censored and I have been banned. I have had speeches on the Senate floor that are protected by the Constitution banned and kicked off of YouTube. I despise these people, but I am not going to vote to ban them because I realize that intellectually, in a free country, I don't have the right to tell the New York Times to publish my op-ed or YouTube to publish my speech. I don't like what they do.

Quit using them. That is what happens in a free country. If you don't like TikTok, quit using them. But don't disenfranchise 150 million Americans who are using a social media app and just say it is no big deal. This is the First Amendment right of 150 million Americans.

I have a host of complaints about domestic social media platforms. They cancel conservatives. But I am not in favor of banning one of them or regulating their speech or telling them who can post and who can't post. That is what the First Amendment is about. If you don't like TikTok or Facebook or YouTube, don't use them, but don't think that any interpretation of the Constitution gives you the right to ban them.

TikTok's mission appears to be like most other companies: to make money and lots of it. TikTok is actually cooperating with our government. There is something called the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—CFIUS—and TikTok has agreed to put all their data in Oracle's

Cloud, and they have agreed to work with the U.S. Government. Because they so much want to make money, they will do anything to try to get rid of this accusation that they are somehow part of the Communist Party, which is not true. It is a company that is owned—probably the majority of it—by Americans and Europeans and other Asians outside of China. Less than 50 percent of it is owned by any Chinese. There is no Chinese Government of the American TikTok.

Even that being said, they are willing to put all of it under the Oracle Cloud. They are willing to have U.S. regulators be given access to it, all because they want to continue to make money. They don't want to be shut down by the censors.

The First Amendment isn't necessary to protect speech that everybody accepts. The First Amendment exists to protect speech that might be unpopular or might be controversial.

U.S. courts have already struck down the Trump ban on TikTok. It amazes me now that the other side that was so horrified by the idea of President Trump banning something has now jumped on board to ban it themselves.

I hope saner minds will reflect on which is more dangerous: videos of teenagers dancing or the precedent of the U.S. Government banning speech. For me, it is an easy answer. I will defend the Bill of Rights against all comers—even, if need be, from members of my own party.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Would the Senator from Kentucky entertain a question?

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, I have never before heard on this floor a defense of the right to spy. I didn't realize that the First Amendment contained a right to espionage.

The Senator from Kentucky mentions the Bill of Rights. I must have missed the right of the Chinese Government to spy on Americans in our Bill of Rights, because that is what we are talking about here.

The Senator from Kentucky can watch as many dance videos as he wants. I have no objection to that. He can watch them on this floor for all I care. Fine. What I object to is the Communist Chinese Party using this app on Americans' phones to spy on Americans without their consent.

The Senator says that Americans can simply not use this app, just turn it off. That is not the case. If you turn it off, it continues to collect information. You don't need to consent. TikTok doesn't ask you do you want to share your information; it takes it. It doesn't ask you for permission to track your location; it takes it. It doesn't ask you for permission to share it with the Chi-

nese Communist Party; it just does it. That is the problem.

Scour the Constitution. Scour the First Amendment. I promise you, you won't find any right to espionage. You won't find any right to spy. And this novel right that the Senator thinks he has discovered for Americans to be spied upon—I never heard of such a thing in the history of this country. I am astounded to learn that Americans have the right to be spied upon.

So not only does China apparently get the right to spy in the First Amendment, Americans have the inalienable right to be spied upon and have all of their data taken from them. That, apparently, is democracy.

That is not democracy. That is the abuse of our laws, the abuse of our economy, the abuse of our people by a foreign government for its purposes.

So I say again, watch dance videos to your heart's content; but spy on Americans, that is where we have to draw the line.

As to money, the Senator said—and I think he is exactly right—that TikTok wants to make money. No doubt about it. And, my, the money they are making; and, my, the money that they are showering on this building. And it is having an effect.

But in the end, the American people don't want to be treated as commodities to be bought and sold, because—make no mistake—it is the American people who are being bought and sold here by TikTok.

They are being sold to the Chinese Communist Party for influence and money. They are being sold for the wishes and the whims of Beijing, and they are being lied to every step of the way.

I will yield to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, there are just a couple of points I want to address. I have been watching in the office; I am not here to make a motion or anything, but this is an important topic. We don't do this enough, which is this back-and-forth, so I will be brief.

The first is, this is not a First Amendment issue, because we are not trying to ban "booty" videos. I don't know if there is a better term for it, but that is not what we are trying to ban. It is not about the content of the videos that are online, it is about the dangers to the national security that are presented by the way that this company functions. And that is what people don't understand and what we owe people an explanation on.

The reason why TikTok—and all the social media companies, for that matter—are addictive is two. They collect a tremendous amount of data on the individual user, not just what you are doing but what you are doing across the platform, your pictures, everything. They want to learn from it, but not just because some guy is sitting

and reading all this stuff. They feed it into an algorithm that is powered by artificial intelligence. It knows you better than you know yourself. That is why the more you use it, the more attractive the videos become to you, because they know exactly how your mind works better than you know how your mind works—at least the algorithm does.

So who owns the algorithm? The algorithm is owned by a company named ByteDance that is in China. Now, listen, I don't care who owns ByteDance. I don't care if it is owned 100 percent by Americans. ByteDance operates out of China. And this is what we need to understand: There are no such things as private companies in China; they do not exist.

Under Chinese law, their national security law, their national intelligence law, every company in China has to do whatever the Communist Party tells them. So if the Communist Party goes to ByteDance and says: We want you to use that algorithm to push these videos on Americans to convince them of whatever, they have to do it. They don't have an option. They may not want to do it. But ask Jack Ma what happens, no matter how rich you are, when you don't want to do what the Communist Party tells you to do. You move to Singapore for a year and disappear. That is what happens.

OK, so all these people have to respond, and ByteDance has to answer to whatever they are told. Now this thing about Oracle and the cloud, it sounds really good, but here's the problem with it: It doesn't matter where you store the data. You could store the data in my backyard in a locked safe. No matter what, for TikTok to work, you have to give the engineers in China access to it because they control the algorithm.

So it honestly doesn't matter where the data is stored. They still have to open it up for the engineers at ByteDance in China to look at it or the algorithm doesn't work; and without the algorithm, there is no TikTok.

You can't buy the algorithm. Do you know why you can't buy the algorithm? Because in 2020, the Chinese Government imposed a law that says it is illegal. You cannot transfer the algorithm out of China.

What made me chuckle last week is when there was this talk of a forced sale, the Chinese Government says: We will block it. And I am like, how can the Chinese Government block the sale of a company they don't control? How can the Chinese Government block the sale of a company that is not theirs?

The answer is, because under Chinese law, ByteDance cannot do anything that they are not allowed to do, and that algorithm can be used against us.

The other one is we will just sell TikTok. Again, TikTok is the name of this platform in the United States.

I heard an argument made that there is no TikTok in China. There is an equivalent to TikTok in China; it is

just not called TikTok. TikTok U.S. is what they call it abroad, but there is an equivalent that uses the same AI formula and the like. The difference is that the videos they allow over there are ones that don't encourage you to choke yourself to death or drink poison or things of that nature.

But, look, it is not about the content. All of these social media companies—there is a difference, though. I am not a fan of Facebook and how they handle things. I am not a fan of any of these social media companies. But the difference is, whatever they do wrong, they do because they want to do it. If the U.S. Government goes tomorrow to Facebook and says: We want you to do X, they will probably say no. They wouldn't need to listen to us under a law. You can subpoena them for records through a process that involves courts, but none of that exists in China. And that is the point that is being missed here.

So last point I want to address: No evidence that they are doing anything now. You go on the video, you can search this and you can search that, absolutely. Because they understand that they want to grow their market share. But I would make the same argument about the weapons. China has hypersonic missiles. There is no evidence they are firing them at us today, but why do they have them?

The Soviet Union—and now Russia—has intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads on them. They never fired them on us. And yet we spend a lot of money making sure they don't and trying to shoot them down if they do.

Every threat is theoretical until the moment it happens. The truth of the matter is this: There is this powerful amount of data, a powerful algorithm entirely controlled at any time they want by the Chinese Government operating in our country, and there is no other way to handle this—not the sale of the company, not the storage of the data. If there was a lesser way to deal with this, I would be for it. But there isn't.

And that is why since 2019, I have been calling for this to be banned. There is no other way to get control of this. The dangers it poses to the country are real. I think before we ban a company that 150 million Americans use, we owe them a better explanation than: Just trust us; it is bad. I agree with that. And we should be doing more of it. But be under no illusion—this is a weapon.

And I will close with this: Think about all the people here that were freaking out because Russia was using bots to influence voters in America on Twitter, Facebook, what have you. Imagine if Russia owned Facebook or Twitter. Imagine if there was a law and now it owned them but told them: You must use it this way. Because that is what we are facing. That is what we have on our hands here.

And not to mention the millions of small businesses in America that have

grown because of TikTok. They will be hostages in the future to a Chinese Government that can destroy their business at a moment's notice unless they can convince their elected officials that America shouldn't defend Taiwan or that America shouldn't be tough on trade.

However they want to weaponize it, the risk is real. I don't waste my time going after social media platforms unless it is important. This is important. I hope we will talk more about it. It deserves the attention that it is starting to get.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, let me just finish with this, that the Senator from Kentucky decried the collection of personal data by American social media companies—and he is right to do that, by the way. I am concerned about that, too, no doubt. But he pointed out that many American social media companies collect all of this information, that they do it without users' consent, sometimes they sell it to third parties for profit, and you can't necessarily opt out of it. All fair enough, but he is protecting exactly what he decries.

The difference is with TikTok, that information is going to a hostile foreign government. It is not a market. It is total control.

So I would just say this to Americans out there who are using TikTok: Just know this—we need to tell you the truth about this app. Just know this: If you have it on your phone, it is tracking your key strokes; it is tracking your movements; it is tracking your location; and it is sending that information—whether you want it sent or not—to Beijing, to the Communist Chinese Party, where it can be accessed by anybody there who wants it, under China's national security laws.

That is a threat to your personal security, and that is why we should act to ban it.

Let me just finally ask the Senator from Kentucky—he and I talked about this before—would the Senator consider allowing us to set a rollcall vote, an up-or-down rollcall vote? Not unanimous consent passed but, as I said, a rollcall vote at a time certain. Would the Senator consent to that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object. I am unlikely to take First Amendment advice from someone who believes that the First Amendment doesn't protect the Communist Party. You will find no greater foe of Communism, no greater critic. I have been a longstanding critic of, really, the funding of research in Wuhan that led to the virus. And yet I still want to protect the basic Bill of Rights, the First Amendment that protects speech, whether we like it or not. And if someone doesn't understand that Communism actually is included in the

First Amendment, that terrible speech we object to is included under that—this is something we should be very wary of.

We should beware of people who peddle fear. We should beware of people who peddle half-truths. Almost everything that has been said about collecting data is, in all likelihood, true. All the social media companies collect data. They devise algorithms. Some of the domestic ones have psychological experiments that might horrify you to see what they have all the young kids thinking and doing and trying to get them to click on different pictures or trying to get them.

This is a marketing strategy, and they all do it. And they all want to make money, and they all want to get clicks.

The difference is this: Many people on the right—in fact, some on the left—they are horrified by Big Tech in our country; they are consistent in being horrified by the abuses of Big Tech here and also TikTok.

But look at their legislative proposals, many of them would actually ban Big Tech here as well or put it under the thumb of government or set up government agencies or panels to determine what speech would be acceptable. And if you are not putting enough conservatives on there, by golly, we are going to have a government commission that is going to determine what kind of content gets on there.

These are scary ideas. Don't succumb to fear. Don't give up our freedoms. Don't say that, oh, my goodness, we are going to ban 150 million Americans. This isn't just about the company; this is about the rights of 150 million Americans to get their content.

You are restricting what they can do, and you are restricting what they can use, all with innuendo. Everything that has been said about, oh, this is a channel and a funnel to the Chinese Government—these are all conjecture. These are all things they are saying happened. As far as the sale of the company, I don't think we should force them to sell, but I do believe, in a heartbeat, they could be sold.

They are located in the Cayman Islands. They are incorporated in the Cayman Islands, and they can be sold at any minute. I don't think we should force them to sell. The majority of the shareholders are not Chinese; the two engineers that developed it are, but to say that the algorithm has to reside in China and is in one tiny place and isn't anywhere else is a simplistic notion of the way technology works.

The company has bent over backwards to work with our government to try to set up something that would be reasonable, including more government oversight. So I, for one, will say that I will continue to defend the First Amendment. And those who believe that the First Amendment doesn't protect the speech are in the wrong, and they will find that out when the Supreme Court rules on this.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, I would just say in conclusion that the security risk from TikTok led us to ban it 4 months ago for the Federal Government. The facts cannot be denied, which is why the TikTok CEO had nothing to say a week ago. He could not deny any of these facts. The truth will carry the day, and we will continue to fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I understand that there is a vote scheduled at 5:45, and in order to clarify the voting procedure this evening, I would initially ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks and the following Senators be permitted to speak for five minutes each prior to the scheduled vote.

I also presume that Senator TUBERVILLE will speak while he reserves his right to object; is that correct? So you do not need time?

In that case, I ask unanimous consent for Senator LEE, Senator HIRONO, Senator BENNET, and Senator MARSHALL to be granted 5 minutes each prior to the scheduled vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to discuss the promotions and appointments of general and flag officers in the United States military, including several appointments to lieutenant general and vice admiral.

These are officers who would hold positions of particular importance and responsibility to the Nation. The promotions of these military leaders were reported out of the Armed Services Committee over the past 2 months.

There have been no substantive objections raised against these nominations. For the benefit of my colleagues who may not appreciate the nature and volume of military promotions and nominations considered by the Armed Services Committee, last year, the Committee considered and the Senate confirmed nearly 20,000 military officers, including 656 general and flag officers.

The Senate confirmed 20,000 nominations through bipartisan unanimous consent because the tradition of the Committee and of the Senate is to consider military nominations as apolitical and thus process them in a timely and respectful manner so our troops do not experience delays in their promotion or appointment or in their pay and benefits.

Moreover, the sheer volume of nominations we consider means we cannot subject them to the ordinary political gamesmanship we see with civilian nominations.

The senior Senator from Alabama has made these promotions a political

matter. He and he alone placed a blanket hold on these officers, unrelated to their qualifications, because of a policy disagreement with the administration that these officers played no part in deciding.

This, in my view, is a profound assault on the professionalism of the men and women of the armed services.

The vast majority of these officers were selected by promotion boards, which are panels of military officers who decide promotions purely on merit, considering the skill, talent, and the military's collective assessment of their potential to lead in the grades for which they have been nominated.

Blanket political holds on military officers, in an attempt to overturn a civilian policy decision, sets a dangerous trend for our military, our political process, our Nation, and this Senate.

The senior Senator from Alabama placed his hold on February 16th, and as a result, not a single general or flag officer nominated in this Congress has been confirmed.

Let me repeat that.

Due to the senior Senator from Alabama's hold, not a single general or flag officer has been promoted.

As the Senator's hold moves into its third month, we will quickly reach a critical mass of backlogged nominations, if we are not already there, that will imperil our national security, degrade unit readiness, and place undue, and undeserved, hardships on military families.

It may not be his intent, but he is effectively accomplishing what our adversaries could only dream of: denying our military of its leadership and degrading our ability to fight and win the Nation's wars.

The bottom line is that military promotions are not a political matter and they are not toys for political gains, and military officers are not tokens in such a game. They are not hostages to issues that are determined by civilian authorities.

An administration's civilian nominees may be fair game, and they have been repeatedly, but not professional military officers. That has long been the Committee's and the Senate's tradition and practice.

And I want to turn to some specific claims made by the Senator from Alabama. He has asserted a number of times that the Department changed the law or that DOD somehow lacked authority. That simply isn't true.

To be clear, under its new policy—and this is with respect to reproductive rights for female soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and guardians—the Department of Defense will provide administrative leave and paid travel if a member of the military or their dependent is stationed in a State or country that does not provide the healthcare needed.

The Department has broad statutory authority to provide travel benefits to servicemembers and their dependents, and it does so routinely, including for

the provision of healthcare services. I am not aware of any assertion from anyone knowledgeable of the law and of the Department's actions that the Department does not have the authority to do this. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge, no serious lawyer has made this argument, and there has not been a single lawsuit filed on this matter.

These policies are, again, travel and administrative leave policies. They do not violate the Federal prohibition on DOD paying for noncovered reproductive health services. Such reproductive health services will still be paid for by members and dependents out of their own pockets. These policies merely facilitate the provision of health services for servicemembers and dependents who may be stationed in an area that does not provide the needed healthcare, including overseas locations.

Further, the senior Senator from Alabama has publicly stated:

"If Democrats are so worried about the nominations, then they can bring them up for a vote. We have more than enough time to vote on nominees."

Setting aside the deeply troubling implication that certain Members of the Republican Party do not care enough about our national defense to ensure that senior military leaders are in place in a timely manner, it would take several months of constant attention on this floor just to move through the current batch of general and flag officers that are presently on the Senate calendar. And this is not even accounting for all the nominations still to come.

If we took this path, this Senate would be consumed entirely by nominating and confirming military officers ad infinitum, unable to do anything else.

And there are currently 184 general and flag officers, including 11 to be promoted to lieutenant general or vice admiral, subject to this political hold.

And let me highlight just three to show you the impact and the consequences of these holds.

One nominee is nominated to be Commander of the Navy's 7th Fleet. It is the largest of the Navy's deployed fleets and has responsibility for the Indo-PACOM area of operations.

And I hear constantly in the Committee and elsewhere on the floor: The Chinese threat—we have got to do more. We just listened to a long diatribe about TikTok and how dangerous it is.

I think what might be more dangerous is not having a confirmed leader for this fleet in the Pacific able to move out immediately to any type of threat coming from the Chinese.

In addition, the Commander of the Navy's 5th Fleet is responsible for the naval and combined maritime forces in the Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf, Arabian Sea, and it is under the overall command of U.S. Central Command. And we hear every day—we heard it just recently—about how the Iranians are taking advantage of us. They say we are not responding strongly enough.

Well, how effective will our response be if we are not quite sure who the Commander of this fleet is? We have got a nominee, but the officer is not confirmed. We have an officer who may have to leave for another assignment. This causes readiness problems, morale problems, and undermines the military that we all seem around here to suggest is our primary concern.

Another one: the U.S. Military Representative to NATO, who is the senior uniformed representative to NATO during a time when NATO is critical to our support of Ukraine, therefore, against Russia.

And, again, my colleagues would stand up and say: We have got to do more for Ukraine. We have to make sure they get the support they need, through coordination with NATO. We have to do all these things, but we really don't need anyone in Brussels to help with military advice and assistance. We will just ignore that.

These are just three examples, and I would like to look ahead because this is just the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

Within the next 8 months, we expect the Department to nominate approximately 650 general and flag officers, including 80 three- or four-star nominees, all of whom will come through the Armed Services Committee and require Senate confirmation.

These include the nomination of the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. By law, General Milley will retire in September. If this hold persists, then we will be without a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We also expect nominations for the service chiefs of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. The Chief of Staff for the Army, the CNO of the Navy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps are scheduled to retire.

If this hold persists, we will not have leadership in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and that would be devastating to readiness, to morale, to the whole history of our government in which we move nominees based on merit, not as political hostages.

We are also talking about major combat commands—Cyber Command. Does anyone have to talk about the relevance of Cyber Command? Again, we just listened to a long, long discussion about cyber security and the stealing of information and governmental interference with that. Cyber Command is the key actor from the Department of Defense standpoint in all of those efforts. And, frankly, without a Commander of Cyber Command, I think the TikTok issue sort of diminishes in importance.

We also have SPACECOM and NORTHCOM. They are responsible for the defense of the United States so that we do not find ourselves here at home devastated by any type of attack, which, today, includes cyber, missile, hypersonics—all those possibilities.

There are also three Deputy Commanders who are coming on—CYBERCOM, CENTCOM, and AFRICOM.

So what you can see is, if this policy continues or this practice continues, we are wiping out the leadership of the Department of Defense and doing an extraordinary disservice to the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States.

We have always treated military nominations appropriately, as beyond the political fray, and we must continue to do so for the good of the service and all those who take the oath, and their families, too, because no military member serves alone. The families serve with him or her.

Now, I believe in a very strong military based on constitutional and professional values. We must not inject political theater into this process.

If we do not have a coherent, organized leadership at the Department of Defense, then we are putting our troops at risk. That is quite simple, and, to me, it is unacceptable.

With that, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I reserve the right to object.

I want to start out by mentioning the great respect I have for Senator REED. I am deeply grateful for the chairman's service to this country, both the service in uniform and as chairman of the Armed Service Committee, of which I am a member.

I believe the chairman and I agree on a lot more than we disagree on, but I take exception to several things that have been said about me by Democratic Members of the Senate.

Every day this week, the majority leader has come to the floor and attacked me by name. It is not very often the majority leader of the Senate attacks a Senator by name 3 days in a row.

Now, in my former profession, I have been called everything so it really doesn't bother me too much, but the majority leader has also tweeted about me. That is good.

So let's get the record straight as we speak.

Right now, I want to talk about what I have done and what I am doing. First of all, I am not blocking anyone from being confirmed or promoted. Every single one of these nominees can receive a vote if Senator SCHUMER wants it. In fact, one of the civilian nominees is getting voted on this week. If Demo-

crats are so worried about these nominations, let's vote. If we are not going to vote on taxpayer-funded abortion, then let's vote on these nominees. Voting is our job. It is not much to ask of the U.S. Senate to do our job, to vote.

Senator SCHUMER and some of the other Senators have claimed that my hold on these nominees is unprecedented.

Well, it is not. My hold is far from unprecedented. In fact, Senator BENNET himself threatened to do this exact same thing just a few months ago. Why? Because the Air Force planned to move Space Command from Colorado to Huntsville, AL. We have talked about this recently. Two years ago, we had a Senator from Illinois put a hold on 1,000 nominees over the promotion of one single officer. So far, my hold has affected 184 nominations.

I also will note that these Senators haven't said a word about our recruiting crisis that we have going on as we speak. Democrats are in a panic about 184 promotions for generals and officers, and yet I have not heard a word from them about the 15,000 enlisted soldiers we are missing right now from last year's recruiting class. That is an entire division.

There is another 8,600 who were discharged over the President's vaccine mandate—kicked out. I don't hear a word about that from the Democrats.

The military is down 23,000 enlisted soldiers due to the actions taken by the Biden administration and his Secretary of Defense just this past year. Yet Democrats are worried about 184 generals getting their promotion? Only one of those things threatens our security. It is not officer promotion.

When my dad was serving in World War II, we had one general for every 6,000 enlisted soldiers—one. Today, we have got one general for every 1,500. We do not suffer from a lack of generals in this country. We suffer from a lack of recruits. Military experts have known for a long time that the Pentagon is top-heavy.

This entire line of attack on me is absolutely false. The generals' jobs are being done. Yet 23,000 enlisted troops that we are missing, their jobs are not being done.

My Democrat friends keep saying abortion is necessary for readiness, but I have yet to hear a shred of evidence to back that up. I have been asking for months. Yet again, my Democrat friends have absolutely zero evidence to show abortion makes our troops safer, stronger, or more lethal.

And let's be clear about what we are talking about. We are not talking about access to abortion. We are talking about taxpayers funding for travel and extra paid time to get elective abortions.

We already have a policy. We already have a policy in the Army about abortion, and it has worked fine. But this policy includes spouses and dependents. We are talking about taxpayer funding for somebody's kid to get an abortion

in another State. This has never been in the policy until now, because Congress has ensured that the Pentagon cannot perform or facilitate abortions except in legal circumstances, and limited.

This morning, I received an email from a soldier's mom in Alabama. She said her son has had to pay thousands of dollars out of his own pocket to buy uniforms and bedsheets. She said it is absurd to force taxpayers to pay for travel for abortions while our troops—our troops—are paying out of pocket for their uniforms. She is right. She is exactly right.

And that is what this is all about. Earlier today, Senator SCHUMER said this is about women making their own choices. That is not true. That is exactly not true. This is about taxpayer funding. That is what we are talking about. We have strict limits on taxpayer funding for abortions in this country. That has gone through this building right here. There has been a bipartisan consensus for 40 years. Yet, all of a sudden, Democrats are saying the military can't win wars without expanded abortion. It doesn't make sense.

Frankly, we already have policies for abortion in the military. Over the last 5 years, there have been about 20 abortions a year performed in the military. These have been in cases of rape, incest, and threat to the life of the mom. Over the 40 years, I don't recall the military ever once complaining that we weren't performing enough abortions. Not one time have I heard that—not one time.

According to one report cited by the Pentagon officials to my staff, the new policy would expand taxpayer-funded abortions from 20 abortions a year to 4,000–4,000. And who is going to pay for that? The people in this country are going to pay for it.

This goes beyond the law without anybody taking a vote here in this building.

We were elected to pass laws. We were elected to do our job. The Department of Defense wasn't elected. They were appointed.

In fact, this contradicts what Congress has actually voted for. This includes some of the people complaining the loudest. Earlier this week, 37 Democratic Senators went on record in asking for the Department of Defense to go beyond the laws that they themselves have voted for. Now, in fairness, I would note that the chairman and Senator SCHUMER were not on that list of 37 Senators.

But the idea that more abortions make our troops safer and more lethal is absurd.

This has been a coordinated campaign to pressure me to lift these holds. That doesn't bother me one bit, and it is not going to work. Frankly, it is just going to make me do the opposite.

I am glad the majority leader is taking notes on these holds. If Democrats want to expand taxpayer funding for

abortion, then let's vote on it. I am ready to vote on it. The majority leader, the last time I looked, controls this floor. He can make it happen. And if these nominees are so important, then we can vote on them too.

So far this year, the Senate has already taken 24 days off. This is in addition to the 2-week recess in January and the 2-week recess which starts at the end of this week. I have only been here for 2 years, but I am told this is one of the slowest years in memory around here. I don't have anything to compare it to. Sometimes, we don't even vote until 5:30 on a Tuesday. People back home don't work those kind of hours, but they are expected to pay for what we are talking about.

Yet the Democrats are in a panic over the idea of taking more votes. I don't mind working full weeks. I worked all my life. I had a full-time job. I will stay here until hell freezes over. I am not going to be intimidated by a campaign of selective outrage.

Let me remind the chairman that I gave the Pentagon fair warning. I gave them fair warning. They chose to go forward with this policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter I sent to Secretary Austin on December 9, 2022.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 2022.

Hon. LLOYD J. AUSTIN III,
U.S. Department of Defense,
Washington DC.

SECRETARY AUSTIN: Your October 20, 2022 memo directing the Department of Defense to explore increasing access to reproductive health care will have broad ramifications for the department's readiness, manpower, and budget. On Wednesday, December 7, my staff received a brief from the (acting) Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and learned that you plan to implement these changes by year's end. The brief also revealed estimates of how your plan will expand the number of abortions subsidized by the DoD. The estimates are as exponential as they are immoral.

The department's authorities to provide for or fund abortions are governed by 10 U.S.C. §1093 which limits these to cases of rape, incest, or pregnancies that threaten the life of the mother. For years, the department has averaged less than 20 abortions per year. The brief revealed the policy intentions put forth in your October 20 memo, "Ensuring Access to Reproductive Health Care," would increase DoD-subsidized abortions by as much as 4,100 per year. That estimate does not include dependents, which your policy also intends to cover, who might seek assistance in obtaining an abortion.

This vast expansion of DoD-subsidized abortions is made worse by how your plan will provide unrestricted access to abortion. As six states and the District of Columbia have no abortion restrictions, your policy would force taxpayers to finance access to abortions without protections other states have duly enacted such as waiting periods and prohibitions on late-term abortions. Like me, many Americans find such abortions morally repugnant.

When questioned on these issues, the department could not provide analysis or estimates of how this policy change will impact

its budget, readiness, and manpower. It is irresponsible to push forward with such a controversial change to department policy without thorough due diligence on how this will impact the readiness of the force.

Lastly, it is my conviction that this proposed policy change is illegal, circumvents Congress, and exceeds your authority. Should you implement these proposed changes to the department's abortion policies, I will place a hold on all future DoD civilian and general/flag officer nominations.

Sincerely,

TOMMY TUBERVILLE,
United States Senator.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Now, I didn't want to do this, and I told the Department of Defense that. I told the people who were in charge of all the nominations.

This was the Biden administration's choice, and I am going to keep my word. And because of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first of all, the notion that we can simply start confirming these officers is patently absurd. There are 184 nominations that are on hold now. We anticipate another 650 general and flag officer nominations throughout the remainder of this year.

Because we get very little cooperation—in fact, none at all—from the Republicans, we average about three nominations a week—Senator DURBIN knows this well—because we have to wait, during quorum calls, to exhaust the hours necessary before we can take the final vote. So we would be working many months, just on this batch of 184, to confirm these officers. And then when we add 650 additional nominations—and they will keep coming and coming—that is absolutely preposterous. It is impossible. So that is not an answer to the problem.

He mentioned Senator DUCKWORTH. Senator DUCKWORTH held nominations for 3 weeks. She was not trying to change the policy of the Federal Government under the Trump administration. She wanted factual information whether President Trump had had politicized the military by interfering with Colonel Vindman's promotion. That is the exact opposite of what the Senator from Alabama is doing. He is holding everybody's nomination as a political action, just like President Trump was trying to do with Colonel Vindman, as reciprocation and as retaliation.

We had a hearing on recruitment at the request of the minority. What are the issues there? The issues are that we have a 3-percent unemployment rate. One of the most significant issues facing the military services is the low percentage of individuals who are eligible and interested in military service.

The issue of whether or not this policy affects recruiting, I think, was refuted by the Senator when he has indicated that he expects 4,000 people to take advantage of this policy. Well, that is not a trivial number. And I would suspect women considering the

military would think hard, regardless of their moral position. They would not like to be in a place where they cannot get access to reproductive care. Twenty percent of the military are women. It is going to have an effect on women. Just look at the polling across the United States about *Roe v. Wade* versus the *Dobbs* decision, and I think you will find that there is a significant number of women who are concerned.

So this is very simple. We are either going to politicize and completely ignore military nominations, using military officers as hostages for political decisions, or we can return to tradition and confirm expeditiously. And one final point, this issue will be considered in the usual order because during the Armed Services Committee markup, I presume there will be amendments on both sides that will be considered fairly, and this issue will be addressed, as it should be, in the context of the National Defense Authorization Act.

What the Senator of Alabama is doing is damaging the military of the United States, perhaps catastrophically, if he continues this policy for many more weeks. That is not appropriate.

With that I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am here to stand in support of my friend and colleague from Alabama, Senator TUBERVILLE, as he stands in opposition and raises his legitimate objections, which I share, to the Department of Defense's plan to use Federal funds to facilitate the performance of abortions.

Look, there has long been among the American people a pretty widespread supermajority of Americans—Republicans and Democrats making up that supermajority—who say, regardless of how they as individuals feel about abortions, they don't want U.S. taxpayer dollars going to fund or facilitate abortions. That overwhelming supermajority preference for that is reflected in legislation that Congress has enacted, codified in 10 U.S.C., section 1093.

So what has happened here is the Department of Defense has very cleverly disguised and very cleverly meandered around that so to technically comply with that statute. Instead of funding abortions and performing them on Federal facilities with Federal resources, they are facilitating, paying for the travel expenses—air, land travel, ground travel, meals—giving 3 weeks of leave in order to perform these. So they are still using Federal dollars to facilitate abortion, just in a way that is carefully gerrymandered around the text of 10 U.S.C., section 1093.

Now, I want to echo what Senator TUBERVILLE said a moment ago about Senator JACK REED. I have profound respect for him. I admire him as a Senate friend and colleague, as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as himself, somebody who has given enor-

mously to his country with his service through the military and otherwise.

I do want to respond to a couple of points that he made because I don't think they lead where Senator REED intended them to lead. He repeatedly described this as a civilian policy decision. Yes, this does embody a civilian policy decision, and it is a policy decision that is fundamentally legislative in nature.

Now, if he wanted this made, he could have easily come to Congress. The Congress, including the U.S. Senate, has long been deferential to the Department of Defense when they come to us and say: We need this or that. This will help us perform our mission to keep our Nation safe and protected from threats to our national security. We are a pretty generous bunch, especially when it comes to the DOD.

So why didn't they do that?

Well, I think they didn't do that—I know they didn't do that—for one simple reason: They knew that the answer would be no.

So, yes, the civilian policy decision—the last I checked, the organ, the branch, of the Federal Government that makes civilian policy decisions that affect the country—that bind the country with law—is this branch. We are the ones who get to set that. Now, sure. They are authorized to make a number of their own internal operating decisions; but whereas here, a policy is so blatantly at odds with the fundamental spirit of the Federal statute enacted into law, they have gone around us. They have carefully written it so as to gerrymander this policy around 10 USC 1093. They wanted nothing to do with us. What Senator TUBERVILLE is doing here is standing up for our prerogative as lawmakers.

Article I, section 1, clause 1 says:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

They want to go around that. I get that. But when they want to go around that and start doing our job, our prerogative is to tell them: It is going to take you a little longer to get some people confirmed.

While, yes, it would be very inconvenient if they had to go through the additional hoops—it is not impossible; they could do it; they could start; they could get a number of people confirmed—they are asking Senator TUBERVILLE to make it easy for them. They want to have their cake and eat it too. So if they want his cooperation, they need to respect the legislative prerogatives of the Senate for which he is standing today. I admire him for doing that and stand with him in this.

As far as not injecting politics—political decision making—into the Department of Defense itself, he has got that exactly backward. He is making a political decision overriding our prerogative to do that and then blaming us for the issue.

Finally, with regard to Senator REED's suggestion that we could deal

with this in the National Defense Authorization Act that is coming before the Senate in the coming months, I get the point. If he is serious about that, I would like to suggest something to Senator TUBERVILLE, and we can talk about this offline, perhaps after we vote. I suspect that if the Department of Defense wanted to really stand behind that, they could offer to suspend this regulation that they have issued—this policy memorandum they issued on February 16—until such time as we can debate it, discuss it, and work on it in the NDAA.

Look, let this be a message to Secretary Austin: If you want to make the laws, run for Congress; but you can't legislate from the E-Ring at the Pentagon. You cannot do that. Until then, stand down and leave the lawmaking to lawmakers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as chair of the Readiness Subcommittee, I rise today deeply opposed to the dangerous posturing of my colleague from Alabama in playing with our national security. That is what it is coming down to.

In the Senate, we have a long history of bipartisan support for our armed services and our servicemembers. What is not usual is for one Member of the Senate to put a hold on hundreds of nominees—let's face it—for political and ideological reasons. I don't know how else you would characterize his actions.

So while we may disagree about military policy—obviously, we do—we have always kept the readiness of our forces above politics. Now the Senator from Alabama is intentionally politicizing our military. The Senators can stand there all they want and say they are not politicizing.

Oh, really? I beg to differ.

The Senator is blocking numerous promotions simply because he is upset that the DOD is doing its part to protect our servicemembers and address their needs. Our servicemembers who are women have a need to access appropriate reproductive care.

Now, this wasn't an issue before because—guess what—we didn't have a Supreme Court that upended almost 50 years of a constitutional right that women in this country had. Why is this important? Because we never had a *Dobbs* decision before. But now we have, and that is what we have to live with.

Because of the Senator's reckless posturing and unyielding stance, the promotions of more than 160 flag officers—men and women who have dedicated their lives to serving our country—are already being delayed, and these delays pose a grave and growing threat to our national security and the readiness of our troops. In the next several months, we are set to consider the

nominations of nearly half—nearly half—of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chairman.

At a time when we face growing threats around the world, leaving these roles unfulfilled would have catastrophic consequences for our military and our national security. Just yesterday, Secretary Austin was before the Armed Services Committee, on which Senator TUBERVILLE and I both sit. Secretary Austin told us that “not approving the recommendations for promotions actually creates a ripple effect through the forces that makes us far less ready than we need to be.”

What is worse is that this hold is all because the Department of Defense is allowing servicemembers to access reproductive healthcare—something well within the Department’s authority. As a result, as I mentioned, of the Supreme Court’s disastrous Dobbs decision, nearly 80,000 women servicemembers—do you know what? If the Senator cares about recruiting and retaining servicemembers, how about wanting to retain and recruit female servicemembers?

So with this Dobbs decision, we now have 80,000 women servicemembers who are stationed in States where they can’t fully access reproductive care. To address this crisis brought on by the Supreme Court’s decision, the DOD adopted a commonsense policy to allow those servicemembers to travel to get the care they need.

To be clear, this policy does not cover the cost of abortions. We are not talking about taxpayer-paid abortions. It would be really great if we could just adhere to facts. The Senator says that this is really a roundabout way to pay for our abortions. No. This is a very direct way to meet the needs of our female servicemembers to get the healthcare and the reproductive care that they so plainly need.

Secretary Austin has said that the health of our servicemembers must be a top priority. Who can argue with that? I couldn’t agree more. I applaud Secretary Austin’s leadership on this issue, but, clearly, my colleague from Alabama is more concerned with pushing his ideological agenda than the realities our troops face.

Our servicemembers put their lives on the line for our country. They deserve better than to be used as political props. Frankly, this obsession that the Republicans have to have power and control over women’s bodies—what is up with that?

For the sake of our country and our troops, I urge my colleague from Alabama and my colleague from Utah to drop this dangerous crusade and confirm the military nominations en bloc.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds. I would love to respond to that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. To the Senator from Hawaii, I would be happy—I would be thrilled—to accept that request, and I will accept it right now. I can’t speak for Senator TUBERVILLE, but I can speak for myself. I will absolutely accept that right now. Let’s get them all done. Get the Pentagon to lift this policy—to suspend it—until we can get it ironed out in the NDAA. I will agree to that right now. If this is as bad, as dire, as apocalyptic, dogs and cats living together in the streets, Book of Revelation stuff, as you describe it, then we should do that. But lift the policy. You can’t legislate from the E-ring of the Pentagon. We will stand up for our rights. And we must.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, we are going to be working on the NDAA, and I suggest to my colleague to go ahead and put an amendment—or whatever he wants—in the NDAA. Then let’s take a vote on whether or not this policy should stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate so much the Senator from Hawaii’s perspective on this really important issue. And it is a really important issue.

I mean, there has been some discussion on the other side about how for 50 years, there has been a consensus in this Chamber about how we treat these issues, ignoring completely what the Dobbs decision has done to this country, which is to strip a 50-year constitutional right—to strip a 50-year constitutional freedom—from the American people. It is the first time since Reconstruction that a right has been stripped from the American people by the Supreme Court. It has been a 50-year crusade—an agenda by the allies of the people across this aisle to accomplish that.

It was a lot earlier today that I heard: Well, I didn’t learn that in law school, I didn’t learn that in law school, about the First Amendment in their debate about TikTok. Well, when I was in law school, that is when originalism was injected into the bloodstream of conservative legal thought in this country. It had not existed before. It was something that was invented by Justice Scalia when he was a law professor, and it was grabbed onto by a lot of people on the other side of the aisle to justify a deeply conservative view of economic history in America.

I would ask my colleagues to allow me to give the rest of my speech before they use profanity on the floor of the Senate to describe what I am talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order. Members are asked to take their conversations off the floor.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I am not offended by that. I just think some of the people at home may not want to hear that kind of language on the floor of the Senate—but that is because they know what I am saying is true about originalism.

Because of their efforts and because they were able to elect Donald Trump, who was not actually read in on the joke, we ended up with three people on the Supreme Court who subscribe to that originalist view and who decided, following Justice Scalia, that if it were not a freedom in 1868, then it is not a freedom in 2023, even though it has been a freedom and a right for the last 50 years in this country.

So don’t come here and say that there was somehow a consensus here when that freedom and that right has been stripped from the American people by the Supreme Court.

To my colleague from Alabama, who has left the floor—by the way, just on that point, he has now twice misrepresented my actions on this floor. So I ask unanimous consent that this article from Politico, which my colleague from Alabama put in the RECORD the last time he was here, misrepresenting my record, be printed in the RECORD. I would like to put exactly the same article in the RECORD so people can actually see the truth of my record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS STEP UP PRESSURE ON BIDEN TO REVERSE TRUMP’S DECISION ON SPACE HQ
(By Connor O’Brien and Lee Hudson)

And one of the state’s senators is even seizing on the politics surrounding abortion and LGBTQ issues, arguing that sending the command from a blue state to a red one takes away the rights of service members.

Sen. Michael Bennet (D-Colo.) “has raised the issue of reproductive health care access in his conversations about the Space Command basing decision,” said one congressional aide, who asked for anonymity to discuss private conversations between Bennet and the Pentagon.

The senator, the aide added, “has serious concerns about the impact that abortion ban laws have on readiness and our national security.”

It’s the latest turn in a saga that’s dragged on for three years after Trump personally directed the Air Force to choose Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Alabama, as the command’s permanent headquarters. Alabama and Colorado were the two finalists in the Air Force’s search.

The decision, if given the final signoff by the Biden administration, would uproot the fledgling command from its current location at Peterson Space Force Base in Colorado Springs. Since the original decision, members of Colorado’s delegation in both parties have decried the move to a Trump-friendly state as political favoritism that will delay the organization from achieving full operating status.

“I haven’t found any Democratic senator who thinks it’s a good idea to allow a precedent to stand that encourages politics to overrule the judgment of our military command,” Colorado Sen. John Hickenlooper said in an interview.

The Biden White House vowed to reassess the choice after lawmakers blasted the basing decision. The Air Force secretary must

still determine whether to follow through with Trump's decision or keep the command in Colorado.

The Air Force was expected to announce a final decision at the end of 2022, but the deadline passed with no ruling.

"We don't have anything new on the decision timeline," the service said in a statement. The service declined to say why a choice has not been made.

Lawmakers on both sides of the argument say they're in the dark on when the Air Force might finally make a call, but both states' delegations have said they believe they will prevail.

"I do think the delay is, in my view, a positive thing," said Rep. Jason Crow (D-Colo.). "My read of that is that the administration is taking a harder look and a fresh look at it and revisiting certain elements of the decision. That's what I hope they're doing."

The commander, Gen. James Dickinson, has said Space Command won't be fully operational until the final basing decision is made.

PROS AND CONS

U.S. Space Command was restarted by the Trump administration in 2019 as it sought to emphasize the importance of the military's space mission, coinciding with the creation of the Space Force. Space Command, which oversees the operations of military space assets and defending satellites, had been its own outfit since the 1980s, but was folded into U.S. Strategic Command following the creation of Northern Command in 2002.

Colorado Springs and Huntsville were two of six finalists selected by the Air Force in late 2020 for the permanent headquarters. The list included military installations in Florida, Nebraska, Texas and New Mexico.

Colorado lawmakers contend permanently keeping Space Command in its temporary home is more efficient and will ultimately prove better for national security because it will be near Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command.

With a large military space presence already in the state, Colorado's leaders argue that politics alone was the deciding factor in the Trump administration selecting Alabama.

They point to comments Trump made after leaving office boasting that he made the call to move Space Command.

"I hope you know that. [They] said they were looking for a home and I single-handedly said 'let's go to Alabama.' They wanted it. I said 'let's go to Alabama. I love Alabama.'" Trump said on an Alabama-based radio show in August 2021.

Alabama's almost entirely GOP delegation says Huntsville—dubbed Rocket City because of the large aerospace industry presence there—checks all the boxes for the new command.

The Pentagon visited each of the six prospective headquarters sites between Dec. 8, 2020, and Jan. 7, 2021, where experts gathered data and refined cost estimates. Those cost estimates were not released publicly, according to the Defense Department's inspector general.

"Democrats said it was political, but the best place to put it is in Huntsville," Sen. Tommy Tuberville (R-Ala.) said in an interview.

"The only reason you would leave it in Colorado is because that's where it's at right now," Tuberville said. "But we need to make sure it's in the right spot. We have the missile defense. We have Redstone Arsenal, NASA. You name it, we got it."

Since a headquarters decision was announced in January 2021, both the Defense Department IG and the Government Ac-

countability Office released reports that questioned whether the selection process was adequate.

DoD IG found the Air Force base analysis that was conducted under the Trump administration's direction "complied with law and policy" when selecting Alabama as the headquarters location, while the GAO asserted the service's base location analysis had "significant shortfalls in its transparency and credibility."

Neither report determined whether Trump meddled in the decision.

Both oversight groups agree a resolution was reached during a White House meeting with high-ranking officials on Jan. 11, 2021.

Meeting attendees included the former president and top Pentagon leaders who have since left—the acting defense secretary, the vice chair of the Joint Chiefs, the Air Force secretary and the assistant secretary of the Air Force for installations, environment and energy.

Days before the meeting, the Pentagon received new information that if Colorado was selected the military could renovate a building instead of having to construct a new one to house the new headquarters.

But the Space Force did not deliver an updated estimate to Air Force officials ahead of the White House meeting, according to GAO.

The Pentagon is keeping the cost estimates private and are not included in the GAO report because the information is designated as "sensitive and privileged."

Opting for renovation instead of new construction would allow for the command to reach full operational much sooner than the estimated six years.

In interviews with the GAO, the head of Space Command, the top Space Force general, and the former vice Joint Chiefs chair, all said they conveyed in the meeting that the headquarters should remain in Colorado because that was the best way to reach full operational capability as quickly as possible.

Bennet echoed the same concerns during a speech on the Senate floor this month.

It is important the Biden administration not ratify "a political decision that was made in the last few days of the Trump administration," Bennet said, referring to the former president dismissing the counsel of Pentagon officials who recommended the headquarters remain in Colorado.

Bennet underscored it is not only expected to be cheaper and faster to keep Space Command in Colorado, but the military would not have to worry over the number of civilian workers who won't opt to move to Alabama. Roughly 60 percent of the Space Command workforce are civilians, he said.

"Decisions of this importance shouldn't be made this way. It should be in the interest of our national security. And the Biden administration has the opportunity to restore the integrity of this process," Bennet said.

RENEWED FIGHT

The Colorado delegation fought the move when it was initially announced, but had gone quiet in the following months. They rekindled their efforts last month when Hickenlooper and Bennet were the only Democrats to join Republicans in opposition to the confirmation of Brendan Owens, the nominee to oversee facilities and energy programs at the Pentagon. The pair said they opposed him because the Pentagon had brushed off their efforts to meet with Austin to discuss Space Command.

Owens was still confirmed despite most Republicans also opposing him.

Bennet also threatened to hold up other nominees to secure a meeting with Austin. Hickenlooper and Bennet met with Austin to discuss the decision on Jan. 26, though no resolution was reached.

"He's got a lot on his plate, so he wasn't versed in the details of the issue," Hickenlooper said. "But he listened very thoughtfully and I think he took it very seriously."

But Bennet continued to press the issue. A spokesperson said Bennet placed a hold on Ravi Chaudhary, Biden's nominee to oversee Air Force installations. He dropped the hold this month after meeting separately with Chaudhary and Air Force Secretary Frank Kendall where he "reiterated his longstanding concerns" with the basing decision. The behind-the-scenes maneuvering has not been previously reported.

Some opponents are also highlighting how the climate in the U.S. has changed since an initial decision was made in January 2021. Many Democrats are unsettled by moving service members from a blue to a red state after the Supreme Court dealt a blow to abortion rights last year.

With the end of nationwide federal protections for abortion, many Democrats have raised the impacts on troops stationed in states where the procedure is now banned or significantly limited. Bennet has publicly raised similar concerns in the proposed Space Command move.

"I'm deeply concerned about how the Dobbs decision and state abortion bans will affect Space Command's workforce and readiness if the command leaves Colorado," Bennet said in a statement to Military.com in August.

Another driver for the Biden administration to keep the headquarters in Colorado and not move to a conservative state are rights for LGBTQ people.

"It's hard not to think about the dramatically more hostile environment in Alabama when it comes to reproductive rights and LGBTQ+ rights," said one Democratic aide. "It'll mean many of the civilians who work for Space Command may not move with it. And service members will be forced to move somewhere where they'll lose those rights."

Though both Tuberville and Hickenlooper downplayed the role the Supreme Court decision would play in the basing move, the impact on troops has been in focus after the reversal of abortion protections under *Roe v. Wade*.

Even Austin, who is usually not outspoken on political issues, moved to shore up troops' access for abortion. He issued a memo in October directing the Pentagon to pay for service members to travel costs for abortions, though not for the procedure itself, arguing the "practical effects of recent changes" in laws will hurt military readiness.

Formal policies issued this month cover travel costs for obtaining abortions as well as administrative leave, as many troops are stationed in states where the procedure is now illegal.

Tuberville was among the GOP lawmakers who slammed the move. He vowed to hold up civilian Pentagon nominations as well as top military promotions over the new policy.

The issue, however, isn't purely about red states vs. blue states. If Space Command doesn't move to Alabama, the headquarters will remain in reliably conservative Colorado Springs. The area and its military assets are represented by Republican Doug Lamborn, who chairs the House Armed Services Strategic Forces subcommittee. Lamborn has also criticized the move as one of political favoritism over national security needs.

The state's other two Republican House members, Reps. Ken Buck and Lauren Boebert, have also protested the decision and signed several letters with Democrats arguing to keep the command in Colorado.

Yet if the Biden administration decides to reverse the earlier decision, it could open

itself up to criticism that it's making a political call, just like the Trump White House. A reversal also would draw push back from Alabama's delegation, including Rep. Mike Rogers, who has new tools at his disposal as the House Armed Services Committee chair.

In the meantime, Alabama lawmakers are confident the Trump administration's decision will be upheld.

"Nobody's saying, but they've done several more reviews on it in the last two years," Tuberville said of the final decision. "And we've pretty much passed all the tests."

Mr. BENNET. I want to thank—he is gone—the Senator from Alabama for finding an article about me in Politico because it is so seldom that any article is written about me. I am grateful that he has called attention to it. He is not here for me to say thank you for that.

But he is now on the floor, doing something that no Senator has ever done—holding up every single flag officer's promotion in this country—180 of them or so, now maybe 600 of them. We have the head of the Seventh Fleet and the head of the Fifth Fleet. These are vital offices that he is holding up.

He just said: We have got enough generals. We have enough generals.

Why is he doing it? Why is he doing it? He is doing it because he is offended by a regulation that the Department of Defense has promulgated in the wake of the Dobbs decision of reversing *Roe v. Wade*—stripping the American people of this fundamental right, stripping the American people of this fundamental right. In the wake of that, the Secretary of Defense had the nerve to say: If you are serving—through no decision that you have made—in a State like Alabama which banned abortion and you have to travel to another State to get an abortion, we will pay for that travel—travel.

If you need a little bit of extra time, the regulations say, before you go to your commanding officer and tell them that you have to have a medical procedure, like abortion, it gives you a little extra time to do that.

The third thing it does is that it says that if you have to leave the State of Alabama because you can't have access to abortion there, then you don't have to use paid leave.

Those are the three things this rule does. I am coming to an end, Mr. President. That is all it does. That is all it does.

In his world, he would like to have a place where people did not have their travel paid for, they had to use their paid leave, and they had to tell their commanding officer immediately. That is the America he wants to live in because he lives in a State—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. BENNET. I would ask the Senate for 30 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Thank you.

He is entitled to his opinion, certainly, and the State of Alabama has a totally different approach to a wom-

an's right to choose than Colorado does, and I respect that even though we differ. But in Alabama, there are no exceptions for rape or incest. In Alabama, if you are a doctor who has committed an abortion, you could go to jail for 99 years. In Alabama, they are trying to say that those women who use chemicals that many women use—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. BENNET.—to end their abortion—all we are saying is—

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order.

Mr. BENNET.—we need to recognize what has happened since Dobbs, and we need—

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. BENNET. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

H.J. RES. 7

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.J. Res 7, a bill that will immediately terminate the COVID-19 national emergency declaration.

Over a year ago, this body voted to end the COVID national emergency declaration. Actually, it has been a year and 26 days ago. Then, it was just 5 months ago that this body voted for a second time to end the COVID national emergency with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 61 to 37. Today, we hope the third time is the charm, that the rumors are true that the President will finally sign this legislation and end this chapter of physical, mental, and financial strife seldom seen in our world's modern history.

Emergency powers are given to the executive branch so the Commander in Chief has the flexibility to quickly act in the event of a crisis. That declaration was appropriate in 2020, but now it is time for the proper constitutional checks and balances to be restored. It is time to end any and all authoritarian control and unilateral spending decisions without congressional consent.

Many, many Kansans have asked me, "What's the holdup, why is the White House waiting to end this emergency declaration?" Well, sadly, I have to tell them, because the emergency declaration has allowed the administration to justify increased spending and push harmful mandates.

Under this national emergency, we have seen a massive increase in government spending across the board. This spending over the past 2 years has resulted in the highest level of inflation Americans have encountered in 40 years. The gross Federal debt has increased by \$3.7 trillion—\$3.7 trillion—since this President took office, an increase of 12 percent. We sadly watched as interest rate hikes, combined with skyrocketing inflation, have raised the amount of debt many Americans hold and made almost everything cost more.

On top of all of this, the authority granted to the President by this emer-

gency declaration has been the direct justification for the White House's efforts to cancel as much as \$20,000 in debt for Federal student loan holders—a plan that would cost taxpayers an additional \$400 billion.

We all understand what it means when politicians say: Never let a good crisis go to waste. But it doesn't stop there. With the national emergency in place, the administration also moved to mandate vaccines for private companies with 100 or more employees. If not halted by the courts, this massive Federal overreach would have forced millions of Americans to choose between the jab or their job.

Next, the White House tried to force healthcare workers, Federal employees, contractors, and even members of our military to receive the vaccine against their choice. Thankfully, these were also halted by the courts across the country.

These are the consequences of a 3-year emergency declaration. Take a good look at the decisions made under this prolonged, supersized government rule, and you will quickly understand why our Founding Fathers warned of this type of abuse of power when they authored the Constitution and made it a top priority to keep each branch of government in line with systems of checks and balances.

I come to the floor today hopefully for one last vote on terminating this declaration.

Is the emergency indeed over? Well, our President himself said as much in a September 2022 interview on CBS's "60 Minutes." I quote the President's direct words: "The pandemic is over."

Enough is enough. It is time to end this chapter and let Americans get back to their own lives.

I ask my colleagues to join me again in a strong bipartisan fashion in sending this resolution to the President's desk to end the national emergency declaration for COVID-19 once and for all today.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 7

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Hassan	Paul
Bennet	Hawley	Peters
Boozman	Heinrich	Ricketts
Braun	Hickenlooper	Risch
Britt	Hoeben	Romney
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Budd	Johnson	Rounds
Capito	Kaine	Rubio
Casey	Kelly	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	King	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Lujan	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Vance
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Ernst	Mullin	Warnock
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Murphy	Young
Grassley	Ossoff	

NAYS—23

Blumenthal	Markey	Schumer
Booker	Menendez	Smith
Cantwell	Merkley	Stabenow
Cardin	Murray	Van Hollen
Carper	Padilla	Warren
Duckworth	Reed	Welch
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden
Hirono	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—9

Barrasso	Feinstein	McConnell
Blackburn	Fetterman	Shaheen
Coons	Hagerty	Whitehouse

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 73, Matthew P. Brookman to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Matthew P. Brookman, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brookman nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 15, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 25, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) was agreed to.

EXPRESSING DEEPEST CONDOLENCES TO AND SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF TÜRKIYE AND SYRIA FOLLOWING THE DEVASTATING EARTHQUAKE ON FEBRUARY 6, 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 76.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 76) expressing deepest condolences to and solidarity with the people of Türkiye and Syria following the devastating earthquake on February 6, 2023.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 16, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, introduced earlier today: S. Res. 135, Osceola Turkey Day; S. Res. 136, AmeriCorps; S. Res. 137, Ombudsman Appreciation Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

REMEMBERING JUDY HEUMANN

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of disability rights activist, Judy Heumann. Today, I join so many touched by her advocacy in mourning her passing, remembering her life, and paying tribute to the contributions she made to the disability community.

Judy's activism began early in life. As a young child who contracted polio and used a wheelchair, she was denied the right to attend school in New York. Later in life, Judy was denied a teaching license after failing her medical exam due to "paralysis of both lower

extremities." She sued the Board of Education and went on to be the first teacher in New York State to use a wheelchair.

Judy served in various capacities throughout multiple Presidential administrations and was instrumental in the passage of groundbreaking legislation including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act. She was the recipient of the Henry B. Betts Award, the Max Starkloff Lifetime Achievement Award, and was featured in numerous documentaries.

I had the honor of working with Judy throughout my time as ranking member and chair of the HELP Committee and seeing firsthand how committed she was to making our world more welcoming and accessible to everyone. Her tenacity was an inspiration to me, and I am grateful that I had the chance to learn from her and work alongside her to make this country more inclusive for all. Her work has improved the lives of so many across our country. She will be remembered fondly.

TRIBUTE TO BARB MALANY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in 1995, Paul P. Harris, a Chicago attorney longing for a sense of community, formed the Rotary Club of Chicago. He envisioned an organization where local professionals could come together, share ideas, and form meaningful relationships. Today, what began as the Rotary Club of Chicago is now Rotary International, a community service organization of more than 1.2 million members with clubs on six continents.

Since 1943, Rotary International has selected up to 150 Rotarians each year as recipients of the Service Above Self Award, their highest individual honor for Rotary members. This award recognizes exceptional humanitarian service, with an emphasis on personal volunteer efforts to help and serve others. This year, Rotary International has selected an incredible teacher, businesswoman, humanitarian, and civic leader to receive its 2023 Service Above Self Award: central Illinois' own Barb Malany.

Born Barbara Bumgardner in Waco, TX, Barb's father served in the Air Force, which meant that Barb and her younger sister Sally never stayed at the same school for more than a few years. But through all of the moves and frequent change, Barb never neglected her studies. She began her college career in Munich, Germany, through an extension program through the University of Maryland. She finished her degree at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, where she studied English and German, and met LeGrand "Lee" Malany, a physics student, and now her loving husband of 58 years. After completing her undergraduate education, Barb earned her master's degree in special education at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

From there, Barb set out to fulfill her lifelong calling: improving the lives of children and young people by teaching English special education to high school students. To this day, Barb serves as a full-time substitute teacher in Springfield, IL.

Aside from teaching, Barb also was a successful small business owner. For two decades, Barb and Lee owned and operated Flowers LeGrand and Gifts in downtown Springfield. Her shop was even designated Small Business of the Year by the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce. But her service to Springfield went far beyond flowers and gifts. Barb was a founding member and president of Downtown Springfield, Inc., a Main Street organization that helped spearhead the redevelopment of Springfield in the 1990s.

Barb's efforts earned her a commendation from the mayor of Springfield "for public-spirited and praiseworthy endeavors." And Barb never strayed too far from her lifelong commitment to helping young people. She used her business to extend internship and mentorship opportunities to young people, an effort that earned her Supervisor of the Year by Springfield School District 186.

Barb also has helped foster an enduring relationship between Springfield and Ukraine. Over the years, Barb has hosted three delegations of Ukrainians who visited Springfield. Thanks to Barb's advocacy, the relationship between Springfield and Ukraine has only grown stronger since Vladimir Putin's senseless invasion of Ukraine. Last year, Barb and other community leaders came together to show their support for Ukraine by setting up a blue and yellow light display at Springfield's Bicentennial Plaza and installing "Peace for Ukraine" banners in downtown Springfield.

But above all else, Barb's commitment to others shines brightest through her role as a foster parent. Her first foster child was one of her high school students who, late one night, was approached by a police officer. The officer offered to take him home, but the young student had to tell the police officer that he did not have a place to live. When the police officer asked if there was anywhere he could take him, the young student gave him Barb's name, knowing that he would be safe with her. Barb took the student in at 1 in the morning, became licensed as a foster parent the next day, and cared for the student as foster child until he finished school and went out into the world. This sparked a new chapter in Barb's life as a foster parent. Over a 20-year period, Barb fostered 17 children, changing their lives for the better, building trust, and showing firsthand what it means to live a life of service to others. Barb's compassion for young people in difficult situations has never waned, and she continues to serve as a foster parent.

So it comes as no surprise that Rotary International chose Barb as one of

this year's Service Above Self Award recipients. Barb is the third member of Rotary District 6460 to receive this distinguished honor. As an active Rotarian for more than 30 years, Barb was just the second woman in Springfield to become a Rotarian. She has been instrumental in shaping and growing Rotary District 6460's youth programs, inspiring students along the way. She has occupied every leadership role in District 6460's youth programs and has hosted more than 20 exchange students, fully immersing herself into their lives as a nurturing and supportive mentor. The bonds she has formed have resulted in lifelong friendships with her students.

Loretta and I congratulate Barb on receiving Rotary International's Service Above Self Award. And we thank Barb and her husband Lee for their many years of service to the central Illinois community, especially to our children and young people. Illinois is grateful for Barb's generosity, leadership, and service to others.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

S. 316

• Mr. COONS. Madam President, today I would like to talk about S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq. It is well past time to repeal the 1991 and 2002 AUMFs. Congress must reaffirm its constitutional authority over war powers, and this vote goes a long way toward asserting the way in which our leaders choose to wage war and use force. Iraq is now a key partner for the United States in the Middle East. I hope the vote today will not only affirm our cooperative and strategic relationship with the country, but also begin a new chapter in U.S.-Iraq bilateral relations. While I was unable to vote in person in its favor, I support the passage of this bill without amendment.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAULKNER COUNTY, ARKANSAS

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Faulkner County, Arkansas's 150th anniversary. Founded on April 12, 1873, Faulkner County has a rich history that is as diverse and vibrant as the rolling hills and farmland that make up its landscape. With the establishment of a railway station in the county seat of Conway, people started to settle in the area. Since then, thousands have come to know the area as home.

Named after the legendary Sandy Faulkner who was instrumental in the early development of Arkansas, Faulkner County has become a beacon of culture and community in the heart of The Natural State. From the official

state historic song, “Arkansas Traveler,” to the renowned Toad Suck Daze festival, Faulkner County has been proud to embrace its heritage and celebrate its unique identity.

With around 125,000 residents, Faulkner County is now the State’s sixth most populated county and home to a thriving economy that has enhanced the quality of life. In Conway, also known as the City of Colleges, students at the University of Central Arkansas, Hendrix College, and Central Baptist College enrich its social life and culture during the school year and long after graduation.

The county’s proximity to Little Rock and major transportation routes makes it an ideal location for industry and business, while Lake Conway and Cadron Creek provide ample opportunities for recreation and relaxation.

As we mark this historic milestone, we celebrate the generations of families, workers, and leaders who have made Faulkner County the wonderful place it is today. From the pioneering settlers who first carved out a life in this beautiful land, to the innovative businesses and industries that now call it home, Faulkner County has always been defined by its spirit of resilience and determination.

Congratulations to the entire community on the 150th anniversary. I applaud the Faulkner County Historical Society for planning celebrations for all to enjoy and commemorate this occasion. I look forward to continuing working with area leaders to support their vision for future growth.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT JOSEPH NUELLE

● Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, today I rise in celebration of Robert Joseph Nuelle’s 95th birthday, who has and continues to live a life defined by service.

Born on April 7, 1928, in Jennings, MO, to Eugene and Sophie Nuelle alongside 11 siblings, Robert attended McBride High School in St. Louis. Following World War II, he chose to serve his Nation and enlisted in the U.S. Navy, the same path of his older brother Kenny. Both served as SeaBees. While serving, Robert was stationed in Pensacola, FL, and later served on a destroyer in the Korean war.

He played baseball for the Navy’s team, and in a very unforgettable moment, he had the opportunity to play with Major League Baseball Hall of Famer Ted Williams. And following his honorable discharge from the Navy, Robert played for the minor league affiliate of the Milwaukee Braves and played semi-pro baseball for another team. While an accident at work unfortunately ended his baseball playing career, Robert found success in other arenas.

Robert worked at Telegraphic Services, later renamed to TSI Graphics, a company that specialized in “Lino-Type,” which entailed printing books

using hot lead. While at TSI Graphics, Robert transformed the company by expanding their business to major publishers in New York and ensuring that the company operated as good corporate citizens. He retired in 1993.

Following his retirement, Robert became heavily involved in philanthropic efforts. He volunteered at Wings of Hope, a humanitarian aviation organization, serving as the charity’s chairman for their golf tournament alongside helping in the charity’s other efforts. Robert also became involved with Friends of Kids with Cancer, where he still volunteers to this day. He has been the chairman of their golf tournament, delivered food to kids going through chemotherapy, and aided in the charity’s mission, which is to support children going through cancer and their families. He still remains a cherished member of their organization. Robert also volunteers at a food pantry every Monday, undeterred by the pandemic.

Robert and his first wife, JoAnn, married in 1955 and moved to Creve Coeur, MO. They had two children, Robert, Jr., and Mark. JoAnn passed away in 2005 after 50 loving years of marriage. Robert was remarried to Peggy Hummert in 2009. Outside of public service, Robert plays golf every week, weather permitting, and enjoys spending time with his children and grandchildren.

Robert truly embodies sacrifice and service. Having served proudly in the military, spent his entire career at a single company, raised a loving family, and dedicated his retirement to philanthropy, he is a shining example of a great Missourian.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13664 OF APRIL 3, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—PM 6

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to

the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2023.

The situation in and in relation to South Sudan, which has been marked by activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan and the surrounding region, including widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, and obstruction of humanitarian operations, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 2023.

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13694 OF APRIL 1, 2015, WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2023.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from, or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared

in Executive Order 13694 with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 29, 2023.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-850. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) for fiscal year 2022; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-851. A communication from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2023; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-852. A communication from the Executive Director of the National Women's Business Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's annual report for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-853. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reimbursement for Emergency Treatment" (RIN2900-AQ08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-854. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updating Presumptive Radiation Locations based on the PACT Act" (RIN2900-AR74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-855. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Traumatic Injury Protection Program Amendments" (RIN2900-AQ53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-856. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled "Coast Guard Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-857. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Civil Penalty Amounts 2023" (RIN2105-AF12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-858. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Operating Cords on Custom Window Coverings" (Docket No. CPSC-2013-0028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-859. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs" (Docket No. CPSC-2019-0025) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-860. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-861. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-862. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Marine Recreational Information Program: Response to National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2017 Recommendations"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-863. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "National Marine Fisheries Service: Response to National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2021 Recommendations"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-864. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting proposed legislation entitled "To amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for young children to be seated adjacent to an accompanying adult passenger on aircraft, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-865. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Yuma, Arizona" (MB Docket No. 22-420) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-866. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FR: Airport Safety Management System" (RIN2120-AJ38) (Docket No. FAA-2010-0997) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-867. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-

off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4048" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-868. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4047" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31472)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-869. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class D Airspace and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selma, AL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0922)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-870. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22273" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1582)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-871. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22353" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1573)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-872. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22352" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1578)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-873. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22354" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1580)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-874. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Airplanes; Amendment 39-22368" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-0424)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-875. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

EC-898. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39-22328" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1419)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-899. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada Corp. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22327" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1477)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-5. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska supporting oil and gas leasing and development within the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 34

Whereas, in 1923, President Warren G. Harding issued an Executive Order establishing Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 on the North Slope region to provide a potential supply of oil for the United States Navy; and

Whereas 42 U.S.C. 6501 (Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976) redesignated Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 as the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska and transferred responsibility for its administration to the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska encompasses 23,500,000 acres, with boundaries extending south from Icy Cape to the drainage divide of the Brooks Range, then following the divide eastward to 156 degrees west longitude, then north to the Colville River, and following the Colville River downstream to its mouth; and

Whereas the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska falls entirely within the boundary of the North Slope Borough and includes the communities of Atkasuk, Nuiqsut, Utqiagvik, and Wainwright; and

Whereas, in 2017, the United States Geological Survey estimated there to be 8,700,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil and 25,000,000,000 cubic feet of recoverable gas reserves in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and

Whereas the 2020 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan and Environmental Impact Statement estimates potential annual government revenue, including local, state, and federal taxes and royalties, of \$730,000,000 to \$4,750,000,000 from oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and

Whereas the 2020 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan and Environmental Impact Statement estimates that the exploration, development, and production of oil and gas in the reserve could generate 3,600 direct jobs and 2,750 indirect jobs annually over a period of 30 years; and

Whereas state royalties from oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska are allocated to the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Impact Mitigation Fund, which is used to provide the local communities of Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk,

Nuiqsut, Wainwright, Utqiagvik, and the North Slope Borough with grants to mitigate impacts related to oil and gas development; and

Whereas, in January of 2022, the Department of the Interior took action that would effectively revert management of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the 2013 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan, removing 7,000,000 acres of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska from potential oil and gas development; and

Whereas the 2020 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan was developed in partnership with the North Slope Borough and in consultation with North Slope tribes and Alaska Native corporations and it included provisions that would have ensured future economic development opportunities for the North Slope region, allowed for community infrastructure needs to be considered in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and required that areas identified by local and Alaska Native entities be excluded from future leasing; and

Whereas the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, and the North Slope Borough are all united in opposition to the Department of the Interior's reversion from the 2020 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan to the 2013 National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan and have expressed concern that this reversion diminishes Alaska Native self-determination by ignoring the needs, concerns, and input of the local people who live, work, and subsist in and around the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska has the potential to extend the life of the Trans Alaska Pipeline System and increase throughput, which has declined from a peak of 2,033,000 average barrels of oil a day in 1988 to 477,800 average barrels of oil a day in 2021; and

Whereas the failure of the Department of the Interior to consult with the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation before taking sweeping action violates Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska would strengthen national security and provide long-lasting benefits to the national economy by creating thousands of jobs nationwide, generating billions of dollars in government revenue, providing affordable energy to American consumers, and decreasing dependence on foreign energy; and

Whereas safe and responsible oil and gas exploration, development, and production has been demonstrated by over 50 years of activity on the North Slope region without adverse effects on the environment or wildlife populations; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, to maximize the area available for oil and gas leasing and development within the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska while conserving and protecting valued fish, wildlife, subsistence, and cultural resources; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, when considering management activities related to the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, to take into account the long history of safe and responsible oil and gas development on the North Slope region and the enormous benefits that development of oil

and gas resources in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska would bring to local communities, tribal governments, the state, and the nation.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Joseph R. Biden, President of the United States; the Honorable Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Deb Haaland, United States Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Tracy Stone-Manning, Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior; Thomas Heinlein, Acting Alaska State Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior; and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the U.S. Representative for Alaska, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM-6. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the United States Congress to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and Government Pension Offset of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas public employees, while employed by the State of Alaska or a political subdivision of the state that participates in the Public Employees' Retirement System of Alaska, are ineligible by law to earn Social Security credits; and

Whereas teachers, while employed by a school district that participates in the Teachers' Retirement System of Alaska, are ineligible by law to earn Social Security credits; and

Whereas provisions of the Social Security Act known as the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset reduce the amount of social security benefits public employees and teachers might otherwise receive if they qualify for Social Security benefits; and

Whereas the Windfall Elimination Provision substantially reduces Social Security benefits earned by public employees and teachers; and

Whereas, in 2021, a Social Security benefit reduction by the Windfall Elimination Provision may be as much as \$498 a month for each recipient; and

Whereas the Government Pension Offset reduces Social Security spousal and survivor benefits for recipients of Social Security spousal or survivor benefits who also receive a benefit from a public employees' or teachers' retirement system; and

Whereas the Government Pension Offset may reduce the Social Security monthly benefit payment, for a current or former public employee or teacher who is eligible to receive a benefit, by an amount equal to two-thirds of the amount the public employee or teacher receives from a public employees' or teachers' retirement system each month; and

Whereas nothing in the relationship between the Public Employees' Retirement System of Alaska, the Teachers' Retirement System of Alaska, or similar public employees' or teachers' retirement systems and Social Security legally or financially justifies a policy of reducing the amount of Social Security benefits earned by public employees or teachers for military service, including civilian military service, or time worked in the private sector; and

Whereas the lowest-earning public employees and teachers are disproportionately and negatively affected by the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; and

Whereas public employees and teachers who reside in the state are disproportionately and more negatively affected, per capita, by the Windfall Elimination Provision

and the Government Pension Offset, than public employees and teachers who reside in any other state or territory in the United States; and

Whereas persons who are eligible to earn Social Security credits for work in the private sector or in active or civilian military service are deterred from becoming public employees or teachers by the negative effects of the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; and

Whereas the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset impair the ability of state and local governments to recruit and retain public school teachers, police officers, firefighters, and other public employees; and

Whereas bipartisan legislation has been introduced in the 117th United States Congress to address the Windfall Elimination Provision and Government Pension Offset;

Be it *Resolved*, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Congress to pass legislation eliminating the Windfall Elimination Provision and Government Pension Offset.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Joseph R. Biden, President of the United States; the Honorable Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Xavier Becerra, United States Secretary of Health and Human Services; the Honorable Miguel Cardona, United States Secretary of Education; the Honorable Andrew Saul, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration; and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the U.S. Representative for Alaska, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM-7. A memorial adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona supporting the enactment by the United States Congress of the Securing America's Land from Foreign Interference Act or similar legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 2002

Whereas, the United States Department of Agriculture reports that at the end of 2020, foreign investors held an interest in more than 37 million acres of United States agricultural land, with China's investment increasing from 13,720 acres in 2010 to more than 350,000 in 2020; and

Whereas, from 2009 to 2016, China's agricultural investments in countries around the world grew substantially; and

Whereas, Chinese investments in American property could provide the Chinese Communist Party with undue leverage over our nation's supply chains as well as access to sensitive national security information; and

Whereas, approximately 14 states have restrictions in place regarding the amount of private agricultural land that foreign interests may own, but the federal government has yet to enact any restrictions on foreign ownership of United States real estate; and

Whereas, as American farmers age and the amount of U.S. farmland changing hands increases in coming years, foreign land grabbing will become an even greater threat; and

Whereas, foreign investments in American farmland, particularly by the Chinese Communist Party, not only provide opportunities for espionage against our military bases and infrastructure but may also undermine our nation's food security; and

Whereas, in the last congressional session, several members of Congress introduced legislation known as the "Securing America's Land from Foreign Interference Act." These bills, S. 4703 and H.R. 3847, would require the United States President to take action to

prohibit members of the Chinese Communist Party from purchasing public or private real estate located in the United States; and

Whereas, it is imperative that Congress take action to prohibit our nation's top adversaries from purchasing land in the United States in order to protect our nation's food supply and national security. Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona:

1. That the Members of the House of Representatives support the enactment of the Securing America's Land from Foreign Interference Act, or similar legislation, to prohibit the sale of United States land to foreign investors.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-8. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska standing in solidarity with the people of Ukraine; condemning the illegal invasion of Ukraine; endorsing the sanctions and export controls directed at the Russian Federation by the United States government; urging the United States Congress and the President to consider measured and appropriate sanctions and actions; demanding the Russian Federation immediately stop all hostilities against Ukraine and withdraw from Ukrainian territory; and supporting the United States in urging the Russian Federation to immediately stop its assault on Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 25

Whereas the post-war international security order led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), has relied on diplomacy, peace, and open communication over armed conflict to ensure prosperity and stability for over 1,000,000,000 people for more than 70 years; and

Whereas, on December 1, 1991, the Ukrainian people voted overwhelmingly to form a State independent from the Soviet Union, building a democracy and a thriving country grounded in the rule of law; and

Whereas the borders of Ukraine were subsequently universally recognized by the international community, including by the Russian Federation; and

Whereas, in 2014, pro-Western protests in Ukraine led to the resignation of authoritarian president Viktor Yanukovich, an ally of Vladimir Putin, and ushered in democratically elected leaders who have sought closer ties to the European Union and the United States; and

Whereas, contrary to the free will of the Ukrainian people in their pursuit of security, peace, and prosperity through closer ties to the European Union and the United States, the Russian Federation annexed territory from Ukraine in 2014 and instigated, supported, and supplied a deadly separatist war in Eastern Ukraine, particularly in the Donetsk and Luhansk provinces of Ukraine, destabilizing the region; and

Whereas the Russian Federation violated international peace and security agreements that sought a peaceful solution in Eastern Ukraine and instead amassed hundreds of thousands of troops on Ukraine's border; and

Whereas Vladimir Putin has now launched an unjust and illegal invasion of the peaceful nation of Ukraine; and

Whereas Russian soldiers are currently sweeping through the country, inflicting violence and terror on millions of civilians and destroying homes, businesses, and economic infrastructure; and

Whereas reports of civilian casualties call for ensuring humanitarian access and respect for human rights and the relevant provisions of international humanitarian law; and

Whereas Ukraine has been a bulwark against Russian military aggression in Europe, and Vladimir Putin has said that Russia's territory should extend to the historical boundaries of Imperial Russia, with possible intentions of threatening NATO allies with military force; and

Whereas Russia's aggression against Ukraine is a violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter, which states that all member states shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations; and

Whereas Ukraine is a nation under siege, and the brutality of this unnecessary and violent war is an affront to both international law and common decency; and

Whereas the United States has galvanized the international community and our allies to impose the strongest possible sanctions on Russia and its financial institutions as a means to inhibit Russia's ability to finance and replenish arms for its war against Ukraine; and

Whereas the patriotism, perseverance, and tenacity the Ukrainian people have shown in defending their country is an inspiration to the entire world; and

Whereas Ukraine deserves the support of every American and the entire international community as it defends itself from this unprovoked Russian invasion, which is the largest attack by one state against another in Europe since World War II; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature proudly stands in solidarity with the people of Ukraine during this horrific and unnecessary war; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature condemns, in the strongest possible terms, Vladimir Putin's violent attack on the people of Ukraine; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature strongly endorses the swift and severe economic sanctions and stringent export controls that the United States has imposed on Russia and urges the United States Congress and the President to consider measured and appropriate sanctions and actions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature supports the United States in urging Russia to immediately stop its violent, illegal, and immoral assault on Ukraine, end the needless bloodshed, completely withdraw its military forces from within Ukraine's internationally recognized borders, and return to diplomacy and the rules-based international order that has ensured peace and prosperity for so many, for so long.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Joseph R. Biden, President of the United States; the Honorable Volodymyr Oleksandrovych Zelenskyy, President of Ukraine; Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, President of the Russian Federation; the Honorable Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Kevin McCarthy, Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Charles Schumer, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Oksana Markarova, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Ukraine to the United States; the Honorable Anatoly T. Antonov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the

United States; members of the United Nations Security Council; and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the U.S. Representative for Alaska, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM-9. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to enact federal legislation that guarantees the right to reproductive freedom, including abortion and contraception; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, January 22, 2023, marks the 50th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113, which affirmed the fundamental right to control reproductive decisions and decide whether to continue a pregnancy or obtain an abortion, which is an occasion deserving of acknowledgment; and

Whereas, *Roe v. Wade* was overturned by a 6-3 vote of the United States Supreme Court in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) 597 U.S. — on June 24, 2022; and

Whereas, *Roe v. Wade* had been the cornerstone of one's ability to control their reproductive lives, affirming the right of anyone who could become pregnant in the United States to decide when and if to have children; and

Whereas, Abortion is a safe and common medical procedure and nearly one in four women in the United States will have an abortion by 45 years of age; and

Whereas, The Turnaway Study shows that denying people abortion creates economic hardship and insecurity that lasts for years and negatively impacts those people and their children; and

Whereas, Maternal death rates are 62 percent higher and perinatal death rates are 15 percent higher in states where abortion is restricted than in states with access to abortion and abortion bans disproportionately harm youth, people with low incomes, and communities of color; and

Whereas, As a result of the *Dobbs* decision repealing *Roe v. Wade*, 13 states have total abortion bans in effect and almost one-third of women and people who can become pregnant of reproductive age in the United States live in a state where abortion is not legal or is severely restricted; and

Whereas, With *Roe v. Wade* overturned, it is likely that abortion will be banned or severely restricted in 24 states, affecting more than 36 million women and even more people who can become pregnant; and

Whereas, Without the protections under *Roe*, there are no federal protections for patients and providers of sexual and reproductive health care from being criminalized for receiving or providing essential health care services; and

Whereas, The State of California stands in strong support of every individual's fundamental right to choose whether to continue a pregnancy; and

Whereas, Four years before *Roe v. Wade*, our state Supreme Court held that Californians have the fundamental constitutional right to procreative choice, a right that follows our state's recognition of the right to privacy in matters relating to marriage, family, and sex, in *People v. Belous* (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 954; and

Whereas, Our state Supreme Court recognized that while, at the time, there was no enumerated privacy right in either our or federal Constitution, the right to privacy was indisputably a fundamental right; and

Whereas, To further lay the groundwork to protect that right, California voters, in 1972,

one year before *Roe v. Wade*, passed a constitutional amendment to explicitly provide for the constitutional right to privacy; and

Whereas, In the immediate aftermath of the United States Supreme Court's devastating decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson*, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed a comprehensive package of legislation expanding, protecting, and strengthening access to reproductive health care, including abortions for all Californians and people seeking such care, in our state; and

Whereas, The Legislature passed Senate Constitutional Amendment 10 to put Proposition 1 on the November 2022 ballot; and

Whereas, The California voters overwhelmingly supported Proposition 1, and enacted a state constitutional right to prohibit the state from interfering with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, which includes their fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to enact federal legislation that guarantees the right to reproductive freedom, including abortion and contraception; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-10. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska encouraging the United States Congress to pass legislation granting the Hmong veterans of the Vietnam War access to the same veteran benefits received by United States veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas, beginning in 1960, the United States Central Intelligence Agency recruited thousands of Hmong people to fight against the Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese Army regulars in Laos; and

Whereas, in July 1961, Brigadier General Edward G. Lansdale wrote in a memo to General Maxwell D. Taylor that about 9,000 Hmong tribesmen had been equipped for guerrilla operations and these operations were being conducted with considerable effectiveness in Communist-dominated territory in Laos; and

Whereas as many as 100,000 Hmong soldiers were recruited and trained as Special Guerrilla Units to engage the North Vietnamese Army; and

Whereas the United States relied heavily on the Hmong Special Guerrilla Units, although outnumbered by enemy forces, to intercept and prevent the flow of troops and war supplies along the Ho Chi Minh Trail; and

Whereas the Hmong soldiers conducted tactical guerrilla actions, flew thousands of deadly combat missions in support of the United States Armed Forces and the Central Intelligence Agency, and fought in conventional and guerrilla combat with an extremely high number of casualties; and

Whereas the Hmong soldiers protected United States personnel, guarded United States Air Force radar installations, gathered critical intelligence about enemy operations, and undertook rescue missions to save the lives of downed United States pilots; and

Whereas approximately 40,000 Hmong soldiers lost their lives defending democracy,

approximately 50,000 Hmong soldiers were seriously injured and disabled, and approximately 3,000 Hmong soldiers were missing in action; and

Whereas Hmong soldiers died at 10 times the rate of United States soldiers in the Vietnam War; and

Whereas, because the war effort of the United States in Laos was covert, the accounts of the sacrifices and service of the Hmong soldiers remain largely unknown; and

Whereas many Hmong soldiers became refugees because the United States government encouraged them to fight for the United States, and, as a result, thousands of family members of Hmong soldiers were evacuated to a United States air base in Thailand to avoid bloody vengeance by the communists in Laos and Vietnam; and

Whereas, after the conclusion of the Vietnam War, thousands of Hmong soldiers suffered acts of retribution and atrocities by the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese, causing hundreds of thousands of Hmong refugees to flee to neighboring Thailand; and

Whereas approximately 50,000 Hmong veterans reside in the United States, and 150,000 Hmong and Laotian-born children have graduated from schools in this country; and

Whereas the Hmong warriors were promised that they would be treated just like other United States veterans; and be it

Resolved and be it that the Alaska State Legislature encourages the United States Congress to pass legislation granting the Hmong veterans of the Vietnam War full access to the same veteran benefits received by United States veterans.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Joseph R. Biden, President of the United States; the Honorable Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Denis McDonough, United States Secretary of Veterans Affairs; the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Charles Schumer, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Kevin McCarthy, Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and all other members of the 117th United States Congress.

POM-11. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to enactment of federal legislation prohibiting federal officials from removing original documents from federal premises; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Special Report entitled "History, Jurisdiction, and a Summary of Activities of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources during the 117th Congress" (Rept. No. 118-6).

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Special Report entitled "Report on Legislative Activities of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, United States Senate, during the 117th Congress 2021-2022" (Rept. No. 118-7).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1020. A bill to require the Administrator of the Economic Research Service to conduct research on consolidation and concentration in the livestock industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 1021. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financing to persons with seriously delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1022. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 1023. A bill to establish an advisory committee to inform Congress of the impact of Waters of the United States regulations on United States agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1024. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities to develop and implement a comprehensive program to promote student access to defibrillation in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1025. A bill to enhance the consideration of human rights in arms exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1026. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1027. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to the People's Republic of China if the People's Liberation Army initiates a military invasion of Taiwan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1028. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1029. A bill to prohibit data brokers from selling, reselling, trading, licensing, or otherwise providing for consideration lists of military servicemembers to a covered nation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1030. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHREN, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1031. A bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1032. A bill to reform Federal Aviation Administration safety requirements for commercial air tour operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

S. 1033. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure certain projects related to natural hazards and emergency management are eligible for funding under the Federal Aviation Administration's airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1034. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program for projects for commercial motor vehicle parking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VANCE, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 1035. A bill to prohibit funding for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change until China is no longer defined a developing country; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KELLY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1036. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to streamline nutrition access for older adults and adults with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER,

Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1037. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from carrying out certain activities under the Electronic Health Record Modernization Program until certification of system stability improvements; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 1038. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve transparency and prevent the use of abusive spread pricing and related practices in the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1039. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to terminate certain contracts on the basis of detrimental conduct to the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1040. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit smoking on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1041. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum salary threshold for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees exempt from Federal overtime compensation requirements, and automatically update such threshold each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1042. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Entrepreneurship Education of the Small Business Administration to establish and maintain a website regarding small business permitting and licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1043. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to modify standards for water heaters, furnaces, boilers, and kitchen cooktops, ranges, and ovens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. FETTERMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CASEY)):

S. 1044. A bill to improve rail safety practices and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. HAWLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1045. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and appropriate Federal regulators have the authority to claw back certain compensation paid to executives; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1046. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments for small airports under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1047. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1048. A bill to designate Mexican cartels and other transnational criminal organizations as foreign terrorist organizations and recognizing the threats those organizations pose to the people of the United States as terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1049. A bill to ensure that older adults and individuals with disabilities are prepared for disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1050. A bill to secure the bulk-power system in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 1051. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to lower the standard for removing employees who disclose tax return information without authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1052. A bill to increase Government accountability for administrative actions by reinvigorating administrative Pay-As-You-Go; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1053. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the use of taxpayer funded union time for employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 1054. A bill to reduce improper payments and eliminate waste in Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1055. A bill to establish an airport infrastructure resilience pilot program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1056. A bill to give Federal courts additional discretion to determine whether pretrial detention is appropriate for defendants charged with nonviolent drug offenses in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1057. A bill to require responsiveness testing of Defense Logistics Agency pharmaceutical contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1058. A bill to protect airline crew members, security screening personnel, and passengers by banning abusive passengers from commercial aircraft flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 1059. A bill to adjust the boundary of Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1060. A bill to provide for congressional review of the imposition of duties and other trade measures by the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1061. A bill to prospectively repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1062. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to restore and standardize work requirements for able-bodied adults enrolled in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1063. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to implement a minimum work requirement for able-bodied adults enrolled in State Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1064. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TILLS):

S. 1066. A bill to increase oversight of foreign direct investment in agricultural land in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1067. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to citizen petitions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 133. A resolution honoring the 30th anniversary of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 134. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Rise Up for LGBTQI+ Youth in Schools Initiative, a call to action to communities across the country to demand equal educational opportunity, basic civil rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students, particularly LGBTQI+ young people, in K-12 schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 135. A resolution designating March 18, 2023, as "National Osceola Turkey Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. COLLINS)):

S. Res. 136. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SULIVAN):

S. Res. 137. A resolution honoring the volunteers of the Coast Guard Ombudsman program on Ombudsman Appreciation Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 138. A resolution highlighting the risks that environmental defenders face around the world and commending their role in defending human rights, combating climate chaos, and supporting a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 113

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 113, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to require a pilot program on activities under the pre-separation transition process of members of the Armed Forces for a reduction in suicide among veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include a criminal penalty and a ground of removability for financing the unlawful entry of an alien into the United States.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S.

414, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 444

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 444, a bill to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification.

S. 547

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 547, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 552

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 552, a bill to extend duty-free treatment provided with respect to imports from Haiti under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

S. 610

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to close loopholes in the immigration laws that serve as incentives to aliens to attempt to enter the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 686, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to review and prohibit certain transactions between persons in the United States and foreign adversaries, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 686, *supra*.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to authorize the National Detector Dog Training Center, and for other purposes.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2023, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 813

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to amend regulations to allow for certain packers to have an interest in market agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 817

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 817, a bill to repeal title IV of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 840

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 840, a bill to protect the rights of the people of the United States under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

S. 912

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 912, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to create a point of order against legislation modifying the number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

S.J. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

S.J. RES. 22

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans".

S. CON. RES. 8

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 8, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution condemning Beijing's destruction of Hong Kong's democracy and rule of law.

S. RES. 107

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 107, a resolution recognizing the expiration of the Equal Rights Amendment proposed by Congress in March 1972, and observing that Congress has no authority to modify a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment after the amendment has been submitted to the States or after the amendment has expired.

S. RES. 129

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 129, a resolution designating March 2023 as "National Women's History Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1040. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit smoking on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON SMOKING IN FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1715 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration

“(a) PROHIBITION.—No person (including any veteran, patient, resident, employee of the Department, contractor, or visitor) may smoke on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘facility of the Veterans Health Administration’ means any land or building (including any medical center, nursing home, domiciliary facility, outpatient clinic, or center that provides readjustment counseling) that is—

“(A) under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

“(B) under the control of the Veterans Health Administration; and

“(C) not under the control of the General Services Administration.

“(2) The term ‘smoke’ includes—

“(A) the use of cigarettes, cigars, pipes, and any other combustion or heating of tobacco; and

“(B) the use of any electronic nicotine delivery system, including electronic or e-cigarettes, vape pens, and e-cigarettes.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1715 and inserting the following new item:

“1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 526 of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-585; 38 U.S.C. 1715 note) is repealed.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1056. A bill to give Federal courts additional discretion to determine whether pretrial detention is appropriate for defendants charged with non-violent drug offenses in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1056

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Smarter Pretrial Detention for Drug Charges Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. RELEASE CONDITIONS AND DETENTION IN FEDERAL CRIMINAL CASES.

Section 3142 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 14135a)” each place it appears and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 40702)”;

and

(2) in subsection (e)(3)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1058. A bill to protect airline crew members, security screening personnel, and passengers by banning abusive passengers from commercial aircraft flights, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. REED. Madam President, today I am introducing the Protection from Abusive Passengers Act, a bill that is aimed at eliminating the rash of violence and abuse that is occurring on commercial flights across the country. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Representatives ERIC SWALWELL of California and BRIAN FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, who are introducing companion legislation in the other body. The goal of our bill is to send a clear signal that individuals who engage in serious abusive or violent behavior on an aircraft or at an airport security checkpoint will be banned from flying.

In the last few years, we have seen an extraordinary increase in the number of cases of violence and abuse against crewmembers and airline passengers. In 2022, the Federal Aviation Administration received 2,456 reports of “unruly passengers.” Those complaints led to 831 investigations, a record 567 enforcement actions initiated, and a historic \$8.45 million in proposed fines. That makes 2022 one of the most violent years in air travel since the FAA started tracking incidents in the mid-1990s, second only to 2021. While the numbers are trending down, we are still seeing some extraordinary dangerous and violent behavior.

In April 2022, the FAA proposed a record \$81,950 fine against a passenger who tried to open the cockpit door on an American Airlines flight from Dallas to Charlotte, struck and threatened multiple flight attendants, and continued to attempt to assault the crew and other passengers once restrained.

The FAA also proposed a \$77,272 fine against a passenger on a Delta flight from Las Vegas who “attempted to hug and kiss the passenger seated next to her; walked to the front of the aircraft to try to exit during flight; refused to return to her seat; and bit another passenger multiple times.”

Just this month, the Department of Justice reported the arrest of a passenger for allegedly attempting to open an emergency exit door while aboard a United Airlines flight from Los Angeles to Boston. During the incident, the passenger attempted to stab a flight attendant with a broken metal spoon, hitting the flight attendant on the neck area three times. Video of this disturbing assault went viral and was widely reported on.

In any setting, these actions would be shocking and unacceptable but on an airplane, such behavior also represents a danger to all passengers. Clearly, the existing regime of civil and criminal penalties have not been enough to deter this upsurge. We need to send a signal that such type of behavior will not be tolerated.

The Protection from Abusive Passengers Act would require the Transportation Security Administration to create and manage a program which bars passengers who are fined or con-

victed of abusive behavior and physical violence from flying. Transparency and notice will be provided to banned individuals, including guidelines for removal and opportunities for appeal. The bill would also permanently ban abusive passengers from participating in the TSA PreCheck or Customs’ Global Entry Programs.

The bill provides appropriate fairness and due process by ensuring that only individuals who have been assessed civil or criminal penalty for abusive and violent behavior will be included on a list of banned fliers. The bill also requires the TSA to explain how it will maintain its list of banned fliers, provide an explanation of how long an individual may be barred from flying based on the severity of the offense, and set guidelines for an individual to appeal and seek removal from the list of banned fliers.

I believe this bill strikes the appropriate balance of assuring fairness and transparency while sending a strong signal that violent and abusive behavior will not be tolerated. I am pleased that the bill is supported by both airline industry leaders and labor unions, including Air Line Pilots Association; Association of Flight Attendants, CWA; Association of Professional Flight Attendants; Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO; Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO; Communications Workers of America, CWA; American Airlines; Delta Airlines; and Southwest Airlines. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this important bill.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1061. A bill to prospectively repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, the Senate today has finally voted to repeal two outdated and obsolete authorizations for the use of military force—those that launched two wars against the Iraqi Government of Saddam Hussein, enacted into law in 1991 and 2002.

Yet this is not the only action we must take to protect our national security. A third AUMF, which Congress enacted in 2001 in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks on our country by the terrorist organization al-Qaida, is also outdated and ought to be repealed. This authorization was fully justified and necessary at the time, and I voted in favor of it.

It was sadly necessary to go to war in Afghanistan to remove the very real threat that al-Qaida posed from its sanctuary there.

But, as I have repeatedly argued in successive Congresses since 2014, this AUMF, too, is now obsolete. We ought to repeal it and replace it with a new AUMF that more accurately reflects the threats our country faces today.

Four Presidents from both parties have used the 2001 AUMF to target groups that did not even exist on 9/11/2001 in countries such as Yemen and

Somalia, far from the battlefield of Afghanistan. Presidents have used this AUMF in ways that those of us in Congress who voted for it could never have imagined 22 years ago.

Publicly available War Powers Resolution notifications that refer to the 2001 AUMF address more than 20 countries, including Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Somalia, Niger, Philippines, Georgia, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, Cameroon, Chad, Nigeria, and Saudi Arabia.

The number of countries where the U.S. military has actually resorted to military action is smaller but not insignificant. Again based on War Powers Resolution notifications, the 2001 AUMF has been publicly cited as authorization for military activity in seven countries: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Niger. No administration should continue to use the 2001 AUMF—that clearly and specifically is aimed at those who perpetrated the 9/11 attacks—as a blank check for war anywhere and anytime, and it is past time for Congress to take action.

In 2014 and 2015, President Obama relayed his intent to work with the Congress to repeal and replace the 2001 AUMF, at the time the United States was assembling the Coalition to Defeat ISIS, but we were not able to get it done.

Now, President Biden has reiterated the same intent. In the official Statement of Administration Policy on the bill we have passed today, the White House declared its support for passage of S. 316 and goes on to say:

Furthermore, President Biden remains committed to working with Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework more appropriate to protecting Americans from modern terrorist threats. Toward that end, the Administration will ensure that Congress has a clear and thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world.

So, in response to the invitation President Biden has extended to Congress to replace and repeal the 2001 AUMF, I am today introducing legislation that would prospectively repeal the outdated authorization—while providing enough time for both the executive and the legislative branches to agree on the most appropriate replacement. This legislation would sunset the existing AUMF in July 2025, 6 months into the next administration. So we will have adequate time to consult with the administration's national security professionals about the best way to do so.

This would also provide a framework for the necessary national debate about how to modernize our national security posture during the upcoming 2024 elections.

This is a pivotal moment. Congress must act to reassert its rightful role in war-making authorities, as set out in

article I of the Constitution. We must take action on all fronts. Having voted decisively to repeal the authorizations of 1991 and 2002 in legislation led by my able colleagues, Senator KAINE of Virginia and Senator YOUNG of Indiana, we now need to move with dispatch to repeal and replace the 2001 authorization. It is a responsibility that we must assume to protect our national security in today's context.

I look forward to moving on this initiative as soon as possible in this session of the 118th Congress.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 133—HONORING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 133

Whereas the National Guard Youth Challenge Program (referred to in this preamble as the “Youth Challenge Program”) is celebrating 30 years of providing successful and free alternative education and structured discipline to at-risk youth between the ages of 16 and 18;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program was born from the visionary concept of using a “whole person” intervention model to combat the effects of gangs, violence, high rates of school dropout, and drug abuse on a generation of youth;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program is a federally and State-funded program that offers a unique opportunity for at-risk youth to change course at a critical time in life;

Whereas the multiphased Youth Challenge Program uses quasi-military discipline and training, coupled with educational instruction, learning, and mentorship, to promote the character development and resilience of at-risk youth;

Whereas one phase of the Youth Challenge Program is a 5½-month residential program that focuses on the following 8 core components: life-coping skills, leadership and followership, service to community, job skills, academic excellence, responsible citizenship, health and hygiene, and physical fitness;

Whereas another phase of the Youth Challenge Program is a 12-month mentoring phase that builds on the 8 core components to help shape youth into productive citizens ready for societal success;

Whereas there is now an optional fifth phase of the Youth Challenge Program called Job Challenge, in which Youth Challenge Program graduates under the age of 21 years old can pursue in-demand job certifications;

Whereas the Youth Challenge Program offers more than 8,000 cadets annually an opportunity to succeed outside of a traditional high school environment;

Whereas there are currently 39 Youth Challenge programs operating in 28 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas more than 200,000 cadets have graduated from the Youth Challenge Program;

Whereas more than 184,000 academic credentials have been awarded under the Youth Challenge Program; and

Whereas graduates of the Youth Challenge Program have improved physically and mentally and are poised to become assets to the communities of the graduates and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that the National Guard Youth Challenge Program has been successfully helping at-risk youth for 30 years;

(2) commends the accomplishments of all of the graduates of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to support—

(A) the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; and

(B) the critical mission of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program to help and develop the character of at-risk youth in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 134—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE RISE UP FOR LGBTQI+ YOUTH IN SCHOOLS INITIATIVE, A CALL TO ACTION TO COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO DEMAND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS, AND FREEDOM FROM ERASURE FOR ALL STUDENTS, PARTICULARLY LGBTQI+ YOUNG PEOPLE, IN K-12 SCHOOLS

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 134

Whereas young people, teachers, school staff, families, and communities must be free from transphobia, homophobia, racism, sexism, and ableism in K-12 schools;

Whereas K-12 schools must be safe and inclusive learning environments that include and affirm LGBTQI+ young people, especially those who are transgender, nonbinary, intersex, Black, Indigenous, people of color, and people with disabilities and those who are from communities that experience marginalization;

Whereas, for more than 2 decades, Congress has supported a resolution for a National Day of Silence, and, for a decade, Congress has supported a resolution for No Name-Calling Week;

Whereas advocates have designated 2023 to 2024 as a time for communities to support the Rise Up for LGBTQI+ Youth in Schools Initiative in support of LGBTQI+ young people in schools by building on the goals of National Day of Silence and No Name-Calling Week to create a sustained call to action to demand equal educational opportunities, basic civil rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students;

Whereas LGBTQI+ young people frequently experience bias-based bullying and harassment, discrimination, and punitive discipline that increases the likelihood they will enter the school-to-prison pipeline;

Whereas over 200 anti-LGBTQI+ education bills are introduced each year in State legislatures across the country, the majority of which specifically target transgender and nonbinary young people, including—

(1) in Idaho, where on March 30, 2020, Governor Brad Little signed the first bill into

law barring transgender students from playing on the school sports teams that correspond with their gender identity;

(2) between 2021 and 2022, 17 additional States have enacted laws prohibiting transgender students from playing alongside their peers on school sports teams;

(3) in Tennessee in 2021, Governor Bill Lee signed a bill that allows any student, parent, or employee to sue if they interact with a transgender person in a school bathroom or other facility; and

(4) in 2022, Alabama and Oklahoma enacted laws that prevent transgender students from using the school bathroom or locker room that corresponds with their gender identity;

Whereas GLSEN's 2021 National School Climate Survey found that LGBTQI+ students who experienced LGBTQI+ discrimination at school in the past year, including being prevented from using the restroom that aligns with the student's gender identity and being barred from playing on the school sports team that aligns with the student's gender identity, were nearly 3 times as likely to have missed school in the past month, had lower GPAs, reported lower feelings of school belonging, and had higher levels of depression compared to LGBTQI+ students who had not experienced LGBTQI+ discrimination;

Whereas LGBTQI+ young people are more likely than their non-LGBTQI+ peers to experience mental health concerns, including stress, anxiety, and depression;

Whereas nearly half of LGBTQI+ young people seriously considered suicide in the last year, a trend that increases among Indigenous, Black, and multiracial LGBTQI+ young people;

Whereas the GLSEN's 2021 National School Climate Survey found that, among LGBTQI+ students who said that they were considering dropping out of school, 31.4 percent indicated that they were doing so because of the hostile climate created by gendered school policies and practices;

Whereas States are passing or attempting to pass legislation that erases or censors LGBTQI+ individuals, history, and contributions from classroom literature and curricula, including—

(1) in March 2022, in Florida, Governor Ron DeSantis signed HB 1557 into law censoring instruction related to LGBTQI+ people, commonly referred to as the "Don't Say Gay or Trans" law;

(2) in May 2021, in Arizona, Governor Doug Ducey signed HB 2035, which would require parental consent for a child to learn about topics such as the United States Supreme Court ruling in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015), that the fundamental right to marry is guaranteed to same-sex couples; and

(3) in 2021, Arkansas, Florida, Montana, and Tennessee enacted laws that treat instruction related to LGBTQI+ individuals in history, science, the arts, or any academic class as a sensitive topic that requires parental notification and allows parents to opt their child out of such instruction;

Whereas these laws harm students and force families to consider leaving their homes, as demonstrated in a Williams Institute report, which found that 56 percent of LGBTQI+ parents of students in Florida considered moving out of Florida and 16.5 percent have taken steps to move out of Florida because of HB 1557;

Whereas States have gone farther by specifically targeting transgender students and their families with policies that attack mental health counseling and gender-affirming care for transgender students, including—

(1) in 2022, in Texas, Governor Greg Abbott issued a directive to the Department of Family and Protective Services to investigate the parents of young people seeking gender-

affirming care for child abuse, which purported to require school professionals to report parents who are supportive of their transgender child for investigation; and

(2) by early March 2023, 34 States have introduced over 135 bills that prohibit or create barriers to the social affirmation of transgender and nonbinary students in schools, such as using a student's chosen name and pronouns, regardless of the risk to the student's safety, health, and wellbeing;

Whereas 85 percent of transgender and nonbinary young people say that recent debates prompted by State legislation restricting the rights of transgender individuals have negatively impacted their mental health;

Whereas every young person must have equal educational opportunity and freedom from the fear that their basic civil and educational rights will be taken away from them;

Whereas young people who develop in positive school climates, free from bullying, harassment, and discrimination, report greater physical and psychological safety, greater mental well-being, and improved educational and life outcomes;

Whereas positive school transformation must recognize that safety is too low of a bar and that all communities deserve to be acknowledged and affirmed in schools;

Whereas students and families, educators, and community members in Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Montana, Tennessee, Texas, and in all States and territories are advocating for safe and inclusive learning environments that affirm LGBTQI+ young people, particularly those who are transgender, nonbinary, Black, Indigenous, people of color, and people with disabilities; and

Whereas we must all demand the best possible future for all young people in schools, particularly those who identify as LGBTQI+, without exception: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the Rise Up for LGBTQI+ Youth in Schools Initiative in demanding the best possible future for all young people in schools, particularly those who identify as LGBTQI+; and

(2) encourages each State, territory, and locality to support the Rise Up for LGBTQI+ Youth in Schools Initiative and adopt laws and policies that prohibit bias-based victimization, exclusion, and erasure.

SENATE RESOLUTION 135—DESIGNATING MARCH 18, 2023, AS "NATIONAL OSCEOLA TURKEY DAY"

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 135

Whereas wild turkey has been an important part of the history and family traditions of the United States;

Whereas wild turkey was on the table at the very first Thanksgiving, and turkey continues to be a mainstay during many holiday traditions;

Whereas wild turkey is a healthy, organic, and delicious source of lean protein;

Whereas 5 subspecies of wild turkey inhabit North America;

Whereas, in the United States, turkey hunters have spent \$76,900,000 per year since 1985 with an economic impact of \$128,700,000 annually;

Whereas Florida has a rich history of wild turkey hunting, management, and research;

Whereas Florida is home to the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program, which is the largest public-private partnership program in

the United States for the maintenance of wild turkey habitat on wildlife management areas and other public lands open to hunting;

Whereas, since the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program began in 1994, upwards of 1,000,000 acres of upland habitat have received funding for turkey habitat management efforts;

Whereas, in the 2022 Florida spring wild turkey season, 25,290 hunters participated in turkey hunting, including 4,744 non-residents of the Sunshine State;

Whereas, in Florida, revenue generated from the sale of wild turkey permits is used for conservation, research, and management of wild turkeys or to promote the cultural heritage of hunting;

Whereas turkey hunters are an important part of the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program, and the money generated from the sale of turkey permits, which are a requirement for hunting wild turkeys in Florida unless exempt, allows the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to make significant contributions to the program each year;

Whereas Florida is home to 2 subspecies of wild turkey, the eastern wild turkey and the Osceola or Florida wild turkey;

Whereas the Osceola is 1 of 5 subspecies of wild turkey in North America;

Whereas the Osceola turkey exists only in peninsular Florida;

Whereas the Osceola subspecies of wild turkey is often perceived as mysterious and the most difficult to harvest because of its small geographic range and the often swampy habitat where it is found;

Whereas hunters in pursuit of all 4 subspecies of turkey in the United States, known as a "Grand Slam", must hunt in Florida; and

Whereas March 4, 2023, is the opening day of turkey harvesting season in part of Florida, and March 18, 2023, is the opening day for the entire state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 18, 2023, as "National Osceola Turkey Day"; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 136—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASSIDY (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. COLLINS)) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 136

Whereas, since their inception, each of the AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors national service programs have proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to bring people of all backgrounds throughout the United States together in common cause to meet the most pressing challenges of communities in the United States; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, each year, more than 200,000 individuals serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors at nearly 40,000 locations across the United States to give back in an impactful way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind support each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers have provided millions of hours of service nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment and restore public lands;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to natural disasters;

(5) to address food insecurity and public health;

(6) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(7) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers recruit and manage millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas, for more than 5 decades, AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companion programs have played an important role in strengthening communities by sharing their experience, knowledge, and accomplishments with the individuals they serve;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,250,000 AmeriCorps members have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to “get things done for America” through the AmeriCorps State and National, AmeriCorps VISTA, and AmeriCorps NCCC programs;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than \$4,400,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States and to pay back student loans;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and support economic competitiveness in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people solving problems by working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2023 from March 12 through March 18, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers for their positive impact on generations of Americans;

(2) to thank the grantees, State service commissions, and community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors for making the programs possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, volunteers, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 137—HONORING THE VOLUNTEERS OF THE COAST GUARD OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM ON OMBUDSMAN APPRECIATION DAY

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 137

Whereas the Coast Guard Ombudsman program was formally established by Admiral James S. Gracey, the 17th Commandant of the Coast Guard, to provide a link between the Coast Guard command and Coast Guard families through the engagement of spouses of members of the Coast Guard;

Whereas the leadership of Wanda Allen-Yearout for over 36 years helped establish and shape the Coast Guard Ombudsman program into the robust volunteer force it is today;

Whereas Ombudsman Appreciation Day is celebrated on March 26, 2023, to honor Coast Guard ombudsmen for the dedicated service they provide to the mission-ready workforce of the Coast Guard;

Whereas Coast Guard ombudsmen serve as volunteers—

(1) providing information and referral resources; and

(2) acting as advocates for the families of members of the Coast Guard;

Whereas the selfless Coast Guard ombudsmen volunteers are essential to the success of the Coast Guard, supporting families to enable service members and service commands to focus on mission requirements;

Whereas, in 2022, Coast Guard service members were helping the public and carrying out missions, and ombudsmen across the Coast Guard were helping by making over 350,000 contacts with, and volunteering more than 13,000 hours to assist, Coast Guard families;

Whereas, recognizing that military service involves sacrifices and difficulties with separation from family, frequent moves, new schools, and long distances from loved ones, Coast Guard ombudsmen respond to ensure military families are not alone by providing vital information to facilitate the transitions of those families to new assignments and to overcome family challenges;

Whereas Coast Guard ombudsmen were vital to supporting family members after the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001, the most extensive organizational transformation of the Coast Guard since World War II;

Whereas, as the Coast Guard responded to and rescued displaced people during Hurricane Katrina, Coast Guard ombudsmen, often consisting of spouses of Coast Guard rescuers and hurricane evacuees—

(1) tracked and accounted for Coast Guard families;

(2) rendered assistance; and

(3) communicated vital evacuation information;

Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, Coast Guard ombudsmen recognized challenges and ensured the operational readiness of the Coast Guard was maintained by providing direct support to Coast Guard families; and

Whereas, by volunteering on the home front, being available for Coast Guard families, and helping Coast Guard families obtain the resources and information necessary for success, Coast Guard ombudsmen help ensure that members of the Coast Guard and their families remain “Always Ready” to meet the needs of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates Ombudsman Appreciation Day and Coast Guard ombudsmen on March 26, 2023;

(2) is grateful to the women and men who volunteer their time as Coast Guard ombudsmen to assist the families of members of the Coast Guard; and

(3) congratulates the volunteers of the Coast Guard Ombudsman program on 37 years of service.

SENATE RESOLUTION 138—HIGHLIGHTING THE RISKS THAT ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENDERS FACE AROUND THE WORLD AND COMMENDING THEIR ROLE IN DEFENDING HUMAN RIGHTS, COMBATING CLIMATE CHAOS, AND SUPPORTING A CLEAN, HEALTHY, AND SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 138

Whereas, around the world, environmental defenders—individuals exercising their human rights to try to peacefully protect an area or the natural resources of such area from negative environmental impact by an ongoing or proposed activity—face persecution from government, private sector, and criminal actors, including restrictions on free speech and assembly, criminalization, civil lawsuits, surveillance, harassment, verbal, cyber, and physical intimidation, sexual assault, and targeted murder;

Whereas at least 1,733 environmental defenders have been reported killed since 2012, with at least 200 killed in 2021;

Whereas at least 1,179 environmental defenders have been reported killed in Latin America and the Caribbean since 2012, making it the region with the highest number of environmental defender deaths and persecution overall, exemplified by the cases of—

(1) Homero Gómez González, who was forcibly disappeared and found dead in Mexico with reported signs of torture after fighting to protect the wintering grounds of the monarch butterfly from illegal logging;

(2) Bruno Pereira, an advocate for the Indigenous Peoples of Brazil’s Amazon, who received threats and was murdered for standing up to illegal logging, mining, and drug trafficking;

(3) Berta Cáceres, a Lenca Indigenous woman, whose murder was ordered by the Honduran company, Desarrollos Energéticos SA, for organizing protests that led to the cancellation of the proposed Agua Zarca Dam; and

(4) the Q'eqchi Mayan Indigenous community, which faces defamation, violent evictions, harassment, and assault by the Guatemalan National Civil Police Force for peacefully protesting the operations of the Fenix mine and growth of palm plantations on their territory;

Whereas at least 427 environmental defenders have been reported killed in Asia since 2012, and governments in the region have also targeted environmental defenders in other manners, including—

(1) the Government of Vietnam, which has sought to silence environmental activist Dang Dinh Bach through imprisonment;

(2) the Government of the Philippines, which has enacted red-tagging campaigns to turn public sentiment against organizations like the Kalikasan People's Network for the Environment; and

(3) the Government of the People's Republic of China, which has falsely charged environmental activists Li Genshan, Zhang Baoqi, and Niu Haibo for illegally hunting or killing wildlife;

Whereas the Government of Egypt hosted the 27th Conference of Parties (COP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, while government security forces held environmental activists Ahmed Amasha and Seif Fateen in extended, arbitrary pretrial detention for joining a terrorist group after forcibly disappearing and torturing them for exercising their rights to free expression;

Whereas Ali Ulvi Büyüknöhtüçü and Aysin Büyüknöhtüçü of Türkiye won lawsuits against mining companies who illegally operated pollution-creating quarries, but were shot and killed by gunmen with alleged ties to those companies;

Whereas fossil fuel companies, mining operations, agribusiness plantations, and mega dams are major causes of environmental destruction and are also being used to drive communities from their homes and their lands;

Whereas rampant corruption and weak rule of law enables those targeting environmental defenders to operate with impunity; and

Whereas civil society is, and should be, a powerful voice for individuals experiencing and at risk from the effects of worsening climate chaos, including Indigenous Peoples whose ancestral rights, lives, traditional lands, and cultural practices are disproportionately threatened by climate chaos: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends and expresses solidarity with environmental defenders as crucial members of civil society who defend both human rights and the environment and play a crucial role in tackling climate chaos;

(2) strongly condemns the targeting, harassment, and unlawful detention of any individual or group for exercising their rights of free association and expression, including advocacy on environmental matters, reporting and seeking information on environmental violations and abuses, or cooperation with local, regional, national, or international mechanisms;

(3) welcomes the relevant principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, done at Rio de Janeiro 1992, and United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/40/11 (2019) as global advancements in recognizing the crucial role that environmental defenders play as human rights defenders;

(4) welcomes the relevant principles of United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/76/300 (2022) as advancing the global conversation towards the importance of a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment as an international human right;

(5) welcomes the United States Government's assertion during its time as Summit Chair of the Ninth Summit of the Americas that environmental defenders should not be denied access to basic environmental information, public participation in proposed projects that would affect their communities, or justice as they seek legal redress from government authorities;

(6) urges the United States Government to consult and cooperate in good faith with Indigenous Peoples who are concerned with the environment in order to obtain the free, prior, and informed consent of such Indigenous Peoples, without coercion, prior to the approval of any project affecting the lands, territories, religious practices, or other natural and cultural resources of such Indigenous Peoples;

(7) welcomes the work of the Department of State-led Interagency Working Group, which invites more than 1000 officials across more than 20 Federal agencies, to reduce violence against environmental defenders and to properly monitor and address the expanding nature and cases of persecution against environmental defenders;

(8) calls for the President to prioritize the global leadership of the United States in tackling reprisals against environmental defenders through a whole-of-government approach in collaboration with foreign governments, multilateral organizations, and civil society organizations;

(9) urges the Department of State to integrate concerns about environmental defenders in all appropriate engagements to exert diplomatic pressure and speak out publicly in countries where environmental defenders are at risk;

(10) requests that the Department of State establish a position focused on environmental defenders within the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor;

(11) requests that the United States Agency for International Development prioritize the finalization of an independent accountability mechanism and the establishment of a position to integrate protection of environmental defenders across broader environmental, economic growth, and human rights and democracy programming in order to better achieve its 2022-2030 Climate Strategy, which seeks to promote a safe and secure political environment at all levels of governance for Indigenous Peoples, human rights and environmental defenders, and local communities to participate in climate actions and the protection of civil society and environmental defenders, including land and resource rights for effective climate outcomes;

(12) encourages the United States International Development Finance Corporation to improve transparency through its independent accountability mechanism, conduct due diligence with partners, and engage in local consultation processes based on free, prior, and informed consent;

(13) encourages the United States Government to use its voice and vote within international financial institutions to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars do not support individuals, foreign governments, or private sector entities that adversely affect the environment or target or expose to harm persons who speak out against such individuals and entities;

(14) encourages the United States to use its leadership in the United Nations Human Rights Council to ensure that the intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights that was adopted by United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/26/9 (2014), creates an internationally legally binding instrument that supports and protects human rights defenders, including environmental defenders;

(15) calls for responsible conduct of United States companies, financial institutions, and investors in relation to the freedoms and rights of Indigenous communities and other environmental defenders, particularly in the agribusiness, fossil fuel, mining, and hydroelectricity sectors; and

(16) calls for the United States to use its influence as a member of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to push for the Conference of Parties to only take place in countries that have and actively encourage a thriving civil society and have taken concrete actions to tackle climate chaos, which stands in contrast to the selection of Egypt and the United Arab Emirates who were selected as hosts in 2022 and 2023, respectively.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 57. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 870, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 57. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 870, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DISASTER LOANS.

Section 7(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(d)(6)) is amended in the third proviso—

(1) by striking “\$14,000” and inserting “\$25,000”; and

(2) by striking “major disaster” and inserting “disaster”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 10:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an open hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

The Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 29, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my State Department fellow, Nathan Lee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of his fellowship with my office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. Shaheen. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my Defense fellow, Quentin Miller, and my foreign policy fellow, Alicia Edwards, be given floor privileges for the remainder of the 118th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH
30, 2023

Mr. Schumer. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 30; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the con-

clusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, and that all time be considered expired; further, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Taylor-Kale nomination and vote on the confirmation of the nomination; that upon disposition of the nomination, the Senate resume legislative session; finally, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. Schumer. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 30, 2023, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 29, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

MATTHEW P. BROOKMAN, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING HELENA LOCAL AND MONTANA SENATE AIDE WITT WILLIAMS FOR HIS OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE AND EXAMPLE ON BEHALF OF THE DEAF COMMUNITY

HON. MATTHEW M. ROSENDALE, SR.

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to honor an outstanding public servant and brilliant young man who refuses to let his disability limit his potential.

Witt Williams is a Helena, Montana native whose parents received the difficult news that their son was born deaf and would likely finish high school reading at a 4th-grade level. Unwilling to accept the limitations of his condition, Witt worked tirelessly with his mother, Wendy, to ensure that he kept up with his hearing peers.

Witt excelled as a student-athlete while attending Helena High, competing on the varsity tennis team and the Great Divide Ski Team, where he placed in the Slalom at the Winter Deaflympics. Witt further distinguished himself in extracurriculars by representing his school at the Montana Behavior Initiative Leadership Conference.

Witt Williams defied the odds that often befall those who are hearing impaired and graduated from Montana State University last spring with a degree in Exercise Science/Kinesiology. His success is all the more impressive considering that he accomplished all this while maintaining a grade point average of 3.75 and graduating with high honors.

Witt currently works for the Montana State Legislature as a Majority Aide. Like any good Montana man, he also has interests outside the legislature and works as a ski racing coach at Great Divide Ski Area and serves as the varsity tennis coach for Helena High School.

I want to commend Witt for his dedicated work in the legislature and in his local community. Witt Williams is an example for all Montanans to follow, and it is my privilege to acknowledge his contributions in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER DUKES AND SETON HALL'S 1953 NIT CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Walter Dukes and the 1953 Seton Hall University National Invitational Tournament (NIT) Championship team. It was ex-

actly 70 years ago that Dukes led the Seton Hall Pirates to the NIT championship. It was a remarkable achievement for Dukes and his teammates, who fought racism and segregation during their historic championship season.

Walter Dukes was Seton Hall's seven-foot tall, African-American center during that magical 1952–53 season. Like most championship teams, the 1952–53 Seton Hall was well-coached with strong players at every position. The Pirates won 31 games that season and lost only two games. They remain the only New Jersey college basketball team to have won a national tournament championship. Dukes was their indisputable leader who pulled down a remarkable 734 rebounds that year, an NCAA Division 1 record that still stands.

Yet, many college basketball fans didn't approve of his presence on a basketball court dominated by white players. At the time, *Life Magazine* wrote about the experience for Dukes and the Seton Hall Pirates under the headline: ROUGH GAME. ROUGHER SEQUEL. In a four-page article, the magazine memorialized one of the ugliest, race-related moments in college basketball history— an angry mob attacking Dukes and his teammates following a loss against the University of Louisville Cardinals.

At the end of the 1952–53 regular season, the Pirates chose the NIT instead of the NCAA Tournament in order to avenge their loss to Louisville. Unfortunately, they never had that opportunity as Louisville was eliminated from the tournament. But, the Seton Hall Pirates continued to win and beat St. John's University, 58–46, to win the 1953 NIT title. Walter Dukes, Seton Hall's star center, was named NIT Most Valuable Player.

Walter Dukes continued to play basketball professionally for a few years with the Harlem Globetrotters and then in the National Basketball Association (NBA) with the New York Knicks, Minneapolis (now Los Angeles) Lakers, and the Detroit Pistons. After his basketball career, Dukes became a civil rights lawyer to protect the rights of African Americans. He died in 2001 of natural causes at the age of 70.

Walter Dukes and his Seton Hall teammates are legends in New Jersey and college basketball lore. They are a team that should inspire all of us for their courage as they battled racism in their pursuit of a championship. Their 1952–53 championship season bears witness to the importance of character and faith to success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. BOB BELL

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and lasting contributions of

Mr. Robert "Bob" Bell. Passing away at the age of 82, Mr. Bell leaves behind an indelible legacy of service to his country and the Winters community.

Born in Missouri in 1940, Mr. Bell spent his early years learning to play the piano, trumpet, and bass, cultivating what would become a lifelong love for music. His passion for the arts continued into adulthood and he played the bass for over 60 years.

After graduating from high school, Mr. Bell joined the Air Force, bravely serving our country in Europe and Southeast Asia. Regardless of where he was stationed, Mr. Bell found opportunities to continue practicing music and played in jazz groups around the world, bringing joy and laughter to international audiences.

Following his service in the Air Force, Mr. Bell joined Golden 1 Credit Union, beginning a three-decade-long career strengthening the financial well-being of California residents. Mr. Bell's financial expertise and knowledge of economic planning significantly advanced the expansion and success of Golden 1 Credit Union. His crucial contributions and indispensable leadership played a vital role in helping Golden 1 Credit Union open 63 new branches and foster the financial stability of tens of thousands of Californians.

Mr. Bell's commitment to California was not only expressed through his tenure with Golden 1 Credit Union, but also through his public service to the City of Winters. He served on the Winters Fire Department Commissioner Board for 16 years, working tirelessly to prepare Winters for any emergency and ensure the health and safety of all Winters residents. Mr. Bell also served on the Winters Senior Foundation Board, valiantly advocating for seniors and playing an instrumental role in enhancing the quality of life for Winters seniors.

In addition to his community leadership, Mr. Bell also exemplified the spirit of altruism and innovation in all areas of his life. For 30 years, Mr. Bell was an active member of the Kiwanis Club of Greater Davis, significantly advancing efforts to identify and address unmet needs in the Yolo County community. His vital work serving his community has helped provide the resources and services necessary to allow all Yolo County residents to thrive.

Mr. Bell will be remembered not only for his decades of service to the Winters community, but also for his genuine spirit of kindness and compassion. He impacted the lives of countless members of his community and his steadfast leadership, constant smile, and patient mentorship undeniably enhanced the lives of his fellow Yolo County residents.

Mr. Bell's enduring spirit will live on in his wife, three children, 10 grandchildren, and the community he dedicated his life to serving. I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Mr. Bell's loved ones. I know that they, along with the people of Yolo County, join me in celebrating his life and legacy.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING TAMMY EDWARDS'
RETIREMENT FROM THE FED-
ERAL RESERVE BANK OF KAN-
SAS CITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, I rise to celebrate the illustrious career of Tammy Edwards, who has served as the senior vice president of the Community Engagement and Inclusion Division at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City since 2019. As her retirement draws near, let us take a moment to reflect upon Tammy's professional accomplishments as well as her many contributions to the community she calls home.

Raised on the east side of Troost Avenue, the corridor historically used to divide Kansas City along racial lines, Tammy attended Kansas City Public Schools and graduated in the top 10 percent of her high school class. Tammy's academic prowess led to her acceptance into the INROADS program, which works to open up pathways to careers for ethnically diverse high school and college students all across the United States. While earning her Bachelor of Business Administration at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, Tammy's involvement in the INROADS program helped her land an internship at United Telecom, the predecessor to Sprint Corporation. Tammy continued her internship throughout her four years of undergraduate study, and after graduating in 1984, she accepted a full-time position with the company, where she would remain for over twenty-six years. In the early years of her career, Tammy went back to UMKC to earn an MBA, which she completed in 1986.

In 2008, Tammy became the vice president of the Community Development Division at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, which covers the 10th District of the Federal Reserve. The District includes Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, Wyoming, northern New Mexico, and western Missouri, where it promotes the public's interest by supporting economic and financial stability. By 2019, Tammy had worked her way up the ranks to become the Bank's senior vice president within the Community Engagement and Inclusion Division. Notably, Tammy also served as director of the Bank's Office of Minority and Women Inclusion and was a member of the Bank's Management Committee, which oversees the institution's strategic planning and policy direction.

Throughout her nearly 15 years at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Tammy helped develop a diverse and welcoming workforce and culture, led engagement initiatives for strategic stakeholders, directed programs aimed at addressing challenging community and economic development issues that affect underserved individuals and communities, helped advance women and minority bankers, and encouraged her colleagues to volunteer outside of work.

Always leading by example, Tammy serves on the board of directors for the Kansas City Friends of Alvin Ailey, the Full Employment Council, Kansas City Scholars, the Kansas City Workforce Investment Board, Kansas City

Public Television, the Metropolitan Community College Foundation, and the Jacob and Ella Loose Foundation. Additionally, Tammy is actively involved at St. James United Methodist Church, the Greater Kansas City Chapter of The Links, Incorporated, and the Greater Kansas City Chamber's Executive Women Leadership Council. Tammy also frequently presents on various leadership, community and economic development, and diversity, equity, and inclusion topics. Indeed, Tammy has faithfully lived up to the words of Luke 12:48, "From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked."

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Tammy Edwards for her years of service to the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. Tammy has spent her entire career using her influence to lift up others, and I wish her all the best in retirement.

HONORING CALVIN HARWOOD

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, Rep. MIKE THOMPSON, in recognition of Calvin Harwood for 25 years of exemplary public service to the Laytonville School District.

Mr. Harwood graduated from Laytonville High School and attended College of the Redwoods in Eureka, California. Consistent with his family's tradition of public service, he joined the Laytonville School Board on December 4, 1997, where he has served as board president continuously since 2000.

Over the past 25 years, Mr. Harwood played a continuous and instrumental role in upgrading school facilities. Under his leadership, the district secured new property and the community approved two local funding measures for school facility improvements. His guidance was essential to the successful construction of the new high school in 2003. During this process, he spent countless hours traveling to Sacramento to address the State Assembly and worked with the Office of Public School Construction on behalf of the district. In 2020, he once again provided stellar leadership during the major modernization of the elementary school campus.

Fellow school board members and school administrators praise Mr. Harwood's honesty and note that he has earned the trust of the school community for always doing the right thing for Laytonville and its students. As Board President, he is valued for his ability to see the big picture and apply informed decision-making to ensure all decisions are focused on long-term benefits for the students. He has been a transparent and a clear communicator when making difficult decisions, including lay-off-offs, school closures, budget cuts, school bus routes, curriculum implementation, expulsions, and not least of all, negotiations.

In addition to his work on the school board, Calvin has served as captain of the Laytonville Volunteer Fire Department, and he coached a variety of sports including little league baseball and basketball.

Mr. Speaker, Calvin Harwood exemplifies what it means to be a community-minded pub-

lic servant. His continuous volunteer service has had an enduring and positive impact on the students and the community of Laytonville, California. Therefore, please join us in recognizing Laytonville Unified School Board President Calvin Harwood.

RECOGNIZING CUSTER GALLATIN
FOREST ENGINEER OF THE
YEAR RECIPIENT PARKS FRADY

HON. MATTHEW M. ROSENDALE, SR.

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise and acknowledge Custer Gallatin Forest Engineer Parks Frady for his dedicated administration of Montana's National Forests and congratulate him as the recipient of the 2022 Managerial Engineer of the Year award.

Parks is a devoted member of the forest team who has distinguished himself on multiple occasions.

But this past summer, when a natural disaster ravaged the forest he manages, Parks displayed the leadership and decisive action that has earned him recognition from his colleagues.

When a 500-year flood event devastated much of the forest and surrounding lands, Parks led extensive rapid response efforts to restore emergency access and coordinated long-term reconstruction efforts to restore the area to its original state.

Under normal circumstances, this tragedy would have incapacitated Custer Gallatin Forest for months. But thanks to Parks' diligent work, the forest and surrounding community have recovered quickly and safely.

I can't thank Parks enough for his service to Custer Gallatin National Forest and the broader Montana ecosystem. His work has earned the respect of his peers, and his continued commitment to excellence will benefit the Custer Gallatin National Forest for years to come.

I'm honored to call Parks Frady a fellow Montanan and privileged to recognize his contributions in the United States House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
PETER EIBERT

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Peter Eibert and his service to Virginia's First District and the Nation.

Peter earned his bachelor's degree from the University of California, Davis where he majored in Political Science. During his undergraduate studies, Peter interned for the People's Vanguard of Davis Inc., UC Davis Athletics, and Congressman DON BACON.

Peter joined my office in June 2022 as my Staff Assistant. He contributed tremendously to providing great constituent service and has been a great mentor to interns. I would like to thank Peter for his contributions and service over the last year. He's been a valuable member of my team, and I wish him the best as he

continues his journey here at the Capitol working for Congressman DAN MEUSER.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Peter Eibert for his service to Virginia's First District and the Nation. May God bless Peter as he continues his career in public service.

HONORING THE WORK AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF CARLOS LEJNIEKS

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with my colleagues, Representatives DEAN PHILIPS, DEBORAH ROSS, and SETH MAGAZINER, to celebrate the extraordinary career and accomplishments of Carlos Lejnieks, the first Latino person to ever be elected President of the Brown University Alumni Association. Though his tenure as President may be coming to a close, the important work he does in and for the community will undoubtedly continue.

Born in New Jersey, Carlos has always been a compassionate and selfless individual. In the 1990s, Carlos dropped out of high school to help support his single mother by working at baseball-memorabilia shows. This is who Carlos is, a person always willing to step up for his loved ones and community.

Carlos was eventually encouraged by mentors to pursue higher education, which led him to Brown University in the Fall of 1996. He graduated from Brown in 2000 with a bachelor's degree in international relations and later, from the London School of Economics with a master's degree in 2004.

Carlos has spent his career giving back to the communities that put him on his path to success. In 2008, he became the CEO of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Essex, Hudson, and Union Counties in New Jersey. Under his leadership, the organization went from serving approximately 100 youth in the community to serving more than 1,100 within four years.

Carlos returned to Brown University in 2015 to begin his service with the Brown University Alumni Association. He was selected to serve as the chair of the First-Generation and Mentoring Committee in 2017 and later as both the President and the Diversity and Inclusion Chair in 2019.

For the last 2 years, Carlos Lejnieks has greatly contributed to Rhode Island and the extensive Brown University Alumni network. Though his time as President may be ending, his impact at the University, in Rhode Island, throughout New Jersey, and all across this country will continue to be felt.

We look forward to seeing what is next for Carlos and extend to him our sincerest thanks for all he has done for our alma mater.

RECOGNIZING GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS'S WOMEN'S HOCKEY NCAA DIII CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BRAD FINSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2023 NCAA DIII Women's Hockey Champions: the Gustavus Adolphus Gusties from St. Peter, Minnesota.

Last week, the team won their first-ever national title in Amherst, Massachusetts in a triple-overtime match. The Gusties claimed the win with a 2-1 final score.

The championship game lasted more than 101 minutes, setting a record for the longest title game in NCAA DIII history. The Gusties' win marks the first NCAA title for a women's hockey team in the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, and the first for any team in the West region.

The team has been nothing but impressive all season, winning every major title and breaking a program record for wins in a season with a record of 27-3-0.

The national title is the first for Gusties Head Coach Mike Carroll, who currently ranks as Minnesota's second-winningest college hockey coach, with 492 total career wins.

It is my honor to recognize this year's NCAA DIII Women's Hockey Champions today. Thanks to the tireless leadership and encouragement from Coach Carroll, the team's staff, families, classmates, and community—these talented young women earned a state championship title and all of us across the First Congressional District are incredibly proud to call them our own.

Congratulations to Coach Carroll and his team on an unbelievable season.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REBUILDING THE UNITED STATES-FLAG INTERNATIONAL FLEET ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the bipartisan "Rebuilding the United States-Flag International Fleet Act". This comprehensive legislation would help to recapitalize the U.S.-flag international fleet of ocean-going, commercial vessels by guaranteeing government cargo during peacetime so that U.S.-flag vessels are available during wartime or emergencies.

The United States has the world's most capable navy able to operate in all five oceans, and we need an equally impressive fleet of commercial cargo vessels crewed by American mariners. For too long, Congress and both Democratic and Republican presidents have allowed the commercial fleet of U.S.-flagged, ocean-going vessels to dwindle. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation's Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the number of ocean-going U.S.-flagged vessels has declined more than 75 percent since 1985, following the 1982 treaty called the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The global supply chain crunch during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russian invasion and blockade of Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China's island building in the South China Sea and saber-rattling in the Taiwan Strait have shown that the United States cannot remain reliant on foreign vessels flying flags of convenience.

The "Rebuilding the United States-Flag International Fleet Act" offers Congress the chance to enact the first comprehensive reform of cargo preference laws in decades. Our legislation incorporates recommendations for the Maritime Administration from the Government Accountability Office's report published on September 14, 2022, entitled "Actions Needed to Enhance Cargo Preference Oversight."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the House to join me in cosponsoring this critical legislation to address this crisis facing the U.S.-flag international fleet.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI DENISE L. EGER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rabbi Denise L. Eger, who is retiring from her duties as Senior Rabbi of Congregation Kol Ami of West Hollywood.

Raised in Memphis, Tennessee, Denise taught religious school and was active in her synagogue as a teen. Although she studied opera and originally intended to be a voice major in college, Denise opted for a career in the religious field, receiving a Bachelor's Degree in Religion from the University of Southern California and a Master's Degree from Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion. She was ordained a Reform Rabbi in 1988, obtained her Doctor of Divinity from Hebrew Union College in 2013 and was awarded an honorary degree in 2022 as a Doctor of Philosophy from Ben Gurion University of the Negev.

A social justice pioneer, Rabbi Eger has had many "firsts." She served as the first openly gay person and first woman as President of the Board of Rabbis of Southern California, and officiated at the first legal wedding of a lesbian couple in California in 2008. Denise was the first openly lesbian or gay President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), the largest and oldest rabbinical organization in North America, and had an integral role in passing CCAR's March 2000 resolution in support of rabbis to officiate lesbian and gay commitment ceremonies. She was a founding President of the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Interfaith Clergy Association and served on the boards of Equality for All/No on Prop 8 and the No On Knight/No on Proposition 22 Campaign, which fought against anti-same-sex marriage ballot initiatives. Believing that activism is a significant duty of her rabbinate, she has worked extensively with persons with AIDS, serving as a past Chair of the Spiritual Advisory Committee of AIDS Project Los Angeles and facilitating an HIV+ support group for over 30 years.

Rabbi Eger has received numerous accolades for her fierce commitment and tireless

advocacy for the LGBTQ+ community and other social justice issues. In 2008, she was named one of the Forward 50 by the Jewish Daily Forward, in 2011 she was given the Community Equality Award by the Human Rights Campaign, in 2014, the City of Los Angeles honored her with the Pioneer Award during Pride Month.

A noted author and speaker, Rabbi Eger was the co-editor of *Gender and Religious Leadership: Women Rabbis, Pastors and Ministers* and the editor of the trailblazing book, *Mishkan Ga'avah: Where Pride Dwells: A Celebration of LGBTQ Jewish Life and Ritual* and has written for several news periodicals. She is a frequent commentator on television and radio on the topics of spirituality, Judaism, family and LGBTQ+ issues.

I ask all members of Congress to join me today in honoring Rabbi Denise L. Eger for 3 decades of compassionate and dynamic leadership at Congregation Kol Ami.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Bangladesh Caucus I want to recognize that 51 years ago on April 4, 1972, the United States recognized Bangladesh's independence from Pakistan.

During the nine-month-long Bangladesh Liberation War, members of the Pakistan Armed Forces and pro-Pakistani militias killed hundreds of thousands of people and injured many more. The war for independence was a struggle for democracy and freedom led by Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

The economic situation facing Bangladesh as it emerged from the war of independence was dire. The Bengali people faced widespread poverty, chronic malnutrition of the masses, the dislocation of over 10 million people who had fled from their homes during the conflict, fragile banking and monetary system and inflation, which ran between 300 and 400 percent, and low foreign exchange resources.

The war of independence had crippled the domestic transportation system with roads, railways and bridges lying destroyed and damaged. The young country was still recovering from a severe Bhola cyclone that had hit the area in November 1970 and caused nearly half a million deaths.

Bangladesh has made enormous strides in the last five decades from one of the poorest nations to having one of the fastest-growing economies in the world, with their GDP per Capita increasing to \$2,457 in 2021 according to the World Bank which now exceeds that of its regional neighbors. Since its independence in 1971, Bangladesh's economy has grown from \$9 billion to \$450 billion, life expectancy has risen from 47 years to 73 years, and the adult literacy rate has risen to more than 75 percent. The Nation has flourished in its independence.

Bangladesh, through the leadership of current Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, has made substantial socioeconomic progress in food

production, disaster resilience, poverty reduction, improved health, education, and women's empowerment. Bangladesh has successfully maintained a moderate Muslim society and curbed extremism in the country, and its people have sought to maintain support for democracy and rule of law rather than descending into authoritarian rule of gun.

The United States and Bangladesh have extensive cooperation on matters of regional and global security, counter terrorism, and climate change. The U.S. is the largest export market for Bangladesh and one of the largest sources of foreign direct investment in Bangladesh. The nation of Bangladesh has contributed to the U.S. economy through bilateral trade and international security cooperation in return.

Bilateral trade between the United States and Bangladesh has increased annually with the main American exports to Bangladesh consisting of agricultural products, aircraft, machinery, engines, and iron and steel products, while American imports from Bangladesh include apparel, footwear, textile products, toys, games, sporting goods, shrimp, prawns; and agricultural products.

Further, the American people appreciate the generous and indispensable role that Bangladesh performs in accepting and sheltering more than 1 million Rohingya people from a genocide perpetrated by its neighbor, Burma. The United States has contributed the largest amount of humanitarian aid to address this crisis, totaling more than \$2 billion.

The American people welcome that Bangladesh is one of the world's largest contributors to United Nations peacekeeping efforts globally. Both countries seek to enhance their people-to-people and government-to-government relationship for shared prosperity. Bangladesh has expressed their gratitude to the United States for contributing more than 100 million doses of the COVID-19 vaccine to the people of Bangladesh.

The U.S.-Bangladesh relationship is strengthened by the Bangladeshi American Community and the large number of Bangladeshi students who come to the U.S. to study. More than 200,000 Bangladeshi Americans have proven themselves to be hard-working, law-abiding, and patriotic citizens of the United States, contributing positively to their communities across the country.

Today, the American people recognize and commend the Nation and people of Bangladesh as they celebrate 51 years of independence. The United States extends its sincere determination to remain a constructive partner of Bangladesh in achieving mutual economic, social, and national security objectives now and into the future.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE HONORABLE JOSEPH L. RUSSELL

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as family, friends, and the community gather to celebrate the life of the Honorable Joseph "Joe" L. Russell, Retired Attorney at Law and College Professor, former Military Judge and California Administrative Law Judge, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this ex-

traordinary and generous businessman, community and civic leader throughout the County of Sacramento and the State of California.

Mr. Russell entered eternal rest on Monday, March 13, 2023 at the age of 80 with wife and family at his side. Today he is being celebrated at the historical landmark Shiloh Baptist Church in Sacramento, California, the Reverend Anthony R. Sadler Pastor presiding.

Born November 17, 1942, in Birmingham, Alabama to Arlee and Eva Lou Russell where he attended; was ranked high in his class and graduated from Parker High School. Joe earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science and Government at Howard University, in Washington DC. Joe earned his Jurist Doctorate Degree at Howard's School of Law. Upon graduating, he was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force where he was promoted to the rank of Captain prior to completing his tour of duty in the service of our country.

Joe met Ida P. Avant in 1963. They were married in 1966 while she was completing her undergraduate degree at Howard University, and he was completing his first year of law school. After concluding his tour of duty with the Air Force, the young couple relocated to Sacramento, California in 1972 to join fellow law school graduate, the late Judge Jimmy Long. They have resided in Sacramento since relocating to the City where they raised their two sons: Joseph Russell, Jr. and Michael Russell.

Joe was licensed and admitted to practice law before the following courts: United States Supreme Court, United States Court of Appeals, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, United States District Court—Eastern District, United States District Court—Northern District, United States Military Court (Attorney and Judge); United States Military Court of Appeals, Alabama State Bar Court, and the California State Bar Court.

He has served the Sacramento Community, State of California and the United States of America as: a well-respected and beloved Military Judge, California Administrative Law Judge, Professor of law courses at California State University, Sacramento for more than 35 years, Attorney at Law, par excellence, for more than 40 years including private practice and as a Senior Deputy City Attorney/City Prosecutor for the City of Sacramento, Civil Leader, Deacon of Shiloh Baptist Church where he has been a very active member and faithful servant of the Lord for nearly 50 years. He was a devoted husband, father and grandfather, brother, uncle, mentor and friend to a multitude and with wife Ida, he was a world traveler.

A partial list of Joe's community and civic service to our community include the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, the Sacramento Urban League, Sacramento Big Brothers and Sisters, the Brotherhood and Deacon Board of the Shiloh Baptist Church, and so many more. Many of Joe's contributions to make a safer and better place in which to live, work, recreate and worship freely are unknown to the public heretofore because he was such a humble person. Joe's passing is a great loss to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stand with me today to honor the Honorable Joseph L. Russell for his life legacy and contribution to the Sacramento community.

RECOGNIZING HELENA LOCAL AND MONTANA SENATE AIDE JACKSON RACICOT FOR HIS OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. MATTHEW M. ROSENDALE, SR.

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the work of an outstanding young man whose service in the Montana Legislature is an example of the extraordinary impact those with physical disabilities can have on their community.

Jack Racicot is an aide to the Montana Legislature and serves as a clerk for the Senate Energy and Telecommunications Committee.

During the 2021 Legislative Session, Jack was on a snowboarding trip at Great Divide Ski Area near Helena where he suffered a debilitating accident that crushed his C5 vertebrae and left him paralyzed from the neck down.

After an extensive recovery at the University of Utah Medical Center, Jack returned to the Senate as an aide in the 68th Legislative Session and continues to serve with distinction to this day. Jack's courageous return to work is a poignant reminder of the strength of Montana's young men and women.

I'm humbled to see such a dedicated young man serving his state despite his injuries, and I am proud to recognize him in the United States House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE DESIGNATION OF GAINESVILLE'S NEW VA CLINICS

HON. KAT CAMMACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Florida's Third Congressional District, I'm proud to recognize the North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System for its service on behalf of our nation's veterans through the dedication of the Gainesville Veteran Affairs Mental Health Facility, which began providing care to veterans in 2022.

The clinic, located in Gainesville, Florida, is a state-of-the-art, 39,932 square-foot facility that offers mental health intensive care management, a psychosocial rehabilitation and recovery center, a substance abuse clinic, a compensated work therapy clinic, a post-traumatic stress disorder clinic, community care, and suicide prevention services. The construction of this facility began in 2017 when it was approved by the U.S. Congress as part of the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017.

Our men and women in uniform make the ultimate sacrifice while fighting to protect our nation, and it is our duty as Americans to ensure that they have exceptional health care following their service to the Stars and Stripes.

The North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System has demonstrated a deep commitment to the needs of veterans and their families by constantly striving to expand and improve the quality of care available to our nation's heroes. The dedication of the Gaines-

ville Veteran Affairs Primary Care Facility, since its opening in 2022, has played a vital role in ensuring that our veterans in Florida's Third Congressional District are provided for through the accessibility of experienced health care providers and critical mental health resources.

I'd like to extend a special thank you to the North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System for all it has done to serve our community in Florida's Third Congressional District, and I'm excited to see how the Gainesville VA Mental Health Facility will continue to provide for our veterans.

RECOGNIZING THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM 35TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Housing Development Consortium for their 35 years of service and affordable housing advocacy within King County.

The Housing Development Consortium (HDC) is a nonprofit organization in King County that has supported countless housing organizations, businesses, and government organizations to meet the housing needs of people with diverse incomes. HDC is a nationally recognized leader in affordable housing advocacy, and their commitment to the Puget Sound region has made tremendous impacts. From fighting for increased funding for new low-income housing to maximizing opportunities for those living on a limited income, HDC continues to play an important role in affordable housing advocacy. Further, HDC pursues these goals through a lens of sustainability to reduce emissions and energy costs for residents. Their work makes our community a safer, better place for all who reside throughout the Puget Sound region.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for the Housing Development Consortium and their critical work, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to ensure that the residents of King County have access to safe and affordable housing.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCLAMATION FOR MISSISSIPPI TORNADO RECOVERY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart as the people of the Mississippi Delta recover from the violent tornadoes that ripped through the 2nd Congressional District last Friday night.

Whereas, the communities in Rolling Fork, Silver City, and Winona were devastated by violent tornadoes on Friday, March 24, 2023; and

Whereas, the Mississippi Delta region is one of the most disadvantaged regions in the United States; and

Whereas, we mourn those who lost their lives, and I am praying for their loved ones in this difficult time; and

Whereas, President Joseph R. Biden, Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas, and Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) Administrator Deanne Criswell acted swiftly to initiate a federal response for the disaster relief effort in Mississippi; and

Whereas, the state of Mississippi has neglected to expand Medicaid through the Affordable Care Act, costing Mississippi over \$14 billion that could have helped communities recover across the 2nd Congressional District; and now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress sends its thoughts and prayers to the people of Mississippi as they pick up the pieces and emerge stronger than ever.

HONORING MAYOR ROBERT "BOB" BLAIS FOR HIS 52 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE VILLAGE OF LAKE GEORGE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Robert "Bob" Blais on an incredible 52-year career as the Mayor of the Village of Lake George. He is currently the country's longest serving mayor and his extraordinary tenure stands as proof of his exceptional stewardship of the Lake George community. While he is retiring at the end of this term, the echoes of his remarkable impact will carry on for decades.

Mayor Blais has devoted the entirety of his adult life to improving and revitalizing the Village of Lake George. He was first elected a village trustee in 1968 but was also a staple in the community for many years prior, serving as a volunteer firefighter, a police officer, and even a dog warden. Just three years after his election to the town board, Blais then mounted a campaign for mayor. He took his first oath of office in June of 1971 and spent the next half century guiding the village toward a brighter future. From strengthening the infrastructure, to preserving Lake George's natural ecosystem, and bolstering the local tourism industry, the outsized effect of Mayor Blais can be seen throughout the village.

From his earliest years in office, Mayor Blais has worked tirelessly to transform the Village of Lake George into a world-renowned tourism destination known for its family friendly atmosphere and widespread appeal. He has been a patient steward of his community's success, a consummate public servant, always willing to set aside his own ego in favor of the village's best interests. Known for responding to every letter and making time for every concern, Mayor Blais put his constituents first, which is a model that all aspiring public servants should aim to follow.

No individual can claim a greater degree of personal responsibility for the village's revitalization and enduring success than Mayor Robert "Bob" Blais. He has dedicated nearly six decades to guiding his local community, and on behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I am honored to recognize his exceptional leadership and celebrate his remarkable career.

GUN VIOLENCE IN ILLINOIS'S
FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. JONATHAN L. JACKSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart in the aftermath of another mass shooting in Tennessee that claimed 6 lives, including 3 innocent children. I stand here as a representative of a district plagued by the epidemic of gun violence.

Chicago, our beloved city, suffers from a firearm homicide rate that overshadows other major U.S. cities. From 2018 to 2022, almost 14,000 shooting incidents have scarred our communities and shattered countless families.

As I speak on this matter, I must emphasize the disproportionate impact on our Black communities. In our state of Illinois, Black individuals are 32 times more likely to die by gun homicide than their White counterparts, a rate triple the national average. This is not just a statistic; it is a heart-wrenching reality and a gross injustice that we must confront and dismantle with unyielding determination.

Our children, the beacons of hope for our future, suffer most in the face of this violence. Firearms are the leading cause of death for children in Illinois, claiming an average of 183 young lives each year. The stark truth is that in Illinois, Black children and teens are 13 times more likely to die from gun violence than their White peers. Around 60 percent of Chicago's youngest children live in communities where 91 percent of homicides took place.

Our children's mental health continues to deteriorate under the burden of fear and anxiety from exposure to gun violence. Over 1 in 4 parents report their children hearing gunshots at home, and 1 in 5 parents say their children's mental health has been negatively affected.

It is our responsibility as lawmakers and leaders to bring forth meaningful change. We must start by implementing comprehensive background checks, closing the gun show loophole, and investing in mental health services for those affected by gun violence. We must pass the assault weapons ban to remove military-style weapons from our streets, prohibit unlicensed firearm ownership, and mandate that firearms transfers occur only with a valid license.

Additionally, we must establish and maintain a federal record of sale system and conduct fingerprint-based nationwide criminal background checks. Had these measures been in place, the gunman who killed 5 people in Aurora, IL in 2019 might have been prevented from acquiring the firearm used in the shooting.

Our children, our communities, and our Nation deserve better. We must be relentless in our pursuit of a safer, brighter future. Let us be united in our resolve, with hearts full of passion and eyes set on the prize of a peaceful tomorrow. Together, we can turn the tide of gun violence and restore hope to our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us join hands in this righteous fight.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF AJ
GUNTHER

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Allen "AJ" Gunther and his service to Virginia's First District and the Nation.

Prior to joining my office, AJ served as a Chaplain in the U.S. Army where he participated in humanitarian operations in Haiti, as well as a tour in Afghanistan and South Korea. He now serves as a Chaplain in the U.S. Army Reserves.

AJ joined my Tappahannock office in April 2021 as a Wounded Warrior Program Fellow and served in that role until April 2023. He helped resolve countless constituents' problems with federal agencies, contributing tremendously to providing the best constituent service in Virginia and the Nation. He has been a friendly and effective representative for myself, my team, and my work throughout the First Congressional District of Virginia and the Tidewater region.

I would like to thank AJ for his dedicated service over the last two years. He has been a key member of my district office team, and I wish him and his family the best as he moves on in his journey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing and thanking AJ Gunther for his service to Virginia's First District and the Nation. May God bless AJ and his family in whatever endeavors he pursues next.

HONORING THE YEARS OF SERVICE OF MS. WENDI LIPSICH IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my District Director, Ms. Wendi Lipsich, for her remarkable 26 years of public service in the House of Representatives.

Since the age of 26, Wendi has been instrumental in helping multiple Members of Congress successfully serve our constituents. Wendi launched her career as a Congressional District Director to former Congressman Robert Wexler in 1997, soon after she graduated from the University of Miami Law School. While working for Congressman Wexler, Wendi married her husband Todd, and had 2 beautiful children, Taylor and Joey.

In commemoration of such a noteworthy career, I would like to relay a message from Congressman Wexler:

With an infectious smile and positive spirit, Wendi Lipsich has been a public servant in the truest sense for three decades. Wendi has helped countless people solve problems big and small. Everyone—and I mean everyone—loves Wendi. And for a good reason. Wendi personifies impeccable character and integrity. What joy it was for me to work alongside Wendi for 15+ years. The people of Palm Beach and Broward Counties owe Wendi enormous gratitude for her never-end-

ing dedication and kindness. Wendi is one of a kind, amazing!

Immediately after Congressman Wexler retired, she was hired as the District Director for my predecessor and friend, former Congressman Ted Deutch, from 2010 to 2022. Congressman Deutch had this to say about Wendi:

Wendi is more than the district director. She is and will continue to be a good friend to anyone needing assistance. Even if it's not related to Congress, people know Wendi will happily do anything she can to try to help them. She cares so deeply about our community and about all of the talented people she has worked with to help our constituents. Everyone, literally everyone, loves and appreciates Wendi Lipsich.

Mr. Speaker, I have always known Wendi to be a selfless public servant, and I am eternally grateful for her service to the constituents of Florida's 23rd Congressional District.

In addition to enjoying her professional life, Wendi goes above and beyond to give back to her community. She is the founder and Co-Chair of the Boca Raton Lupus Walk with the Alliance for Lupus Research and continues to play an active role in raising awareness and funds to help cure lupus. Wendi has also been the Hillel of Broward and Palm Beach Board Member and Chair of the Student Life Committee, Guardian Ad Litem Child Advocate with the 15th Judicial Circuit of West Palm Beach, Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County, Business and Professional Cabinet Co-Chair and Board Member, KidSafe Foundation Board Member, Spanish River Community High School Foundation Board Member, Junior League of Boca Raton's Volunteer of the Year honoree, Democratic Professionals Council of Palm Beach County, Alliance of Delray Association, Democratic National Convention Delegate and a supporter of many other charities.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating my friend and colleague, Ms. Wendi Lipsich, as she embarks on the next chapter of her career. I am eternally grateful to her for her years of service to our Nation and wish her all the best.

RECOGNIZING CUSTER GALLATIN FISHERIES BIOLOGIST CLINT SESTRICH FOR EARNING THE OUTSTANDING FISHERIES PROFESSIONAL AWARD FROM THE MONTANA AMERICAN FISHERIES SOCIETY

HON. MATTHEW M. ROSENDALE, SR.

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, Montana's biodiversity and breathtaking natural beauty attract countless researchers and naturalists to our great state. This makes Clint Sestrich's recognition as this year's Outstanding Fisheries Professional by the Montana Chapter of the American Fisheries Society particularly impressive.

Clint became a member of the fisheries society in 1997 and has led multiple conservation efforts over the past 25 years. He distinguished himself on numerous occasions for his stewardship of Montana's fish populations, including his work on the Upper Shields YCT

restoration and conservation project, the Buffalo Creek Restoration project, and by securing \$1.5 million in funding for the Slip and Slide Creek Wetland Restoration and Curlyleaf Pondweed Eradication Project.

But Clint's biggest contributions to preserving the natural splendor of Montana's fisheries came from his recent leadership on the restoration of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the Custer Gallatin National Forest.

Clint Sestrich's commitment to conservation will undoubtedly benefit Montana wildlife for generations to come. His dedication stands as a stark example of the work all Montanans can do to preserve the natural world.

I'm honored to stand with the Montana American Fisheries Society and all fisheries biologists by recognizing Clint's inspirational service to conservation, and it is my privilege to acknowledge his work in the United States House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 27, 2023, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote on two roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 163, and YEA on Roll Call No. 164.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VAL T. HOYLE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, although I am not able to come in to vote because I have COVID-19, I want to make clear my position on Roll Call No. 167, Boebert amendment No. 2 to H.R. 1. This amendment would add a Sense of Congress expressing disapproval of the State of Oregon's denial of permits for the now defunct Jordan Cove Nat-

ural Gas facility in Coos Bay. Had I been present, I would have voted against this amendment.

The Jordan Cove Energy Project would have built a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) export terminal and pipeline in Oregon's 4th Congressional District. Initially I supported this project as it provided an opportunity to bring good-paying union jobs back to Oregon's south coast and support a region still working to economically recover from the collapse of the timber industry.

The federal government and the state of Oregon have environmental laws and robust standards in place to ensure that significant projects are in the public's interest. As Oregonians, we demand accountability and will stand in defense against polluting our water or destroying our ecosystems.

The amendment on its face is ridiculous. The failure to move forward and build the Jordan Cove Energy Project is not the fault of the State of Oregon. Multiple state agencies conducted a thorough and fair review of the project. While some permits were denied, the project sponsor ultimately withdrew their application. In fact, the Oregon Department of State Lands granted the project sponsor multiple extensions to share the necessary information to process the permit. Blame for the withdrawal does not lie with the State of Oregon, nor the federal government.

Bringing high-quality jobs back to Southwest Oregon has been and continues to be a top priority of mine. We can do that while also protecting our environment and without building new fossil fuel infrastructure.

We are working to rebuild our middle class by bringing in good paying jobs and supporting our rural economies. That's why I am joining a broad coalition of people to support the Port of Coos Bay's container terminal project which would bring the West Coast's first ship-to-rail container port to Oregon. This container project has the potential to bring up to 9,000 new jobs to my congressional district and relieve supply chain congestion, all while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I'll continue to focus my energy on real solutions for everyday Oregonians and Americans as opposed to dwelling on the past.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2023

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote on two roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 165, and NO on Roll Call No. 166.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 30, 2023 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 3

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the 2024 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers budget and implementation of Water Resources Development Act of 2022.

SD-406

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 316, Authorizations for Use of Military Force Against Iraq.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1007–S1060

Measures Introduced: Forty-eight bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1020–1067, and S. Res. 133–138. **Pages S1052–53**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled “History, Jurisdiction, and a Summary of Activities of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources during the 117th Congress”. (S. Rept. No. 118–6)

Special Report entitled “Report on Legislative Activities of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, United States Senate, during the 117th Congress 2021–2022”. (S. Rept. No. 118–7) **Page S1051**

Measures Passed:

Authorizations for Use of Military Force Against Iraq: By 66 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 77), Senate passed S. 316, to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1007–16**

Withdrawn:

Schumer Amendment No. 15, to add an effective date. **Page S1016**

Revised Definition of Waters of the United States: By 53 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 79), Senate passed H.J. Res. 27, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’”. **Pages S1017–24**

COVID–19 National Emergency Act: By 68 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 80), Senate passed H.J. Res. 7, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020. **Pages S1028–44**

Authorizing the Use of the Capitol Grounds: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 15, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition. **Page S1044**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 25, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. **Page S1044**

Condolences to the People of Turkiye and Syria: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 76, expressing deepest condolences to and solidarity with the people of Turkiye and Syria following the devastating earthquake on February 6, 2023, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1044**

National Osceola Turkey Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 135, designating March 18, 2023, as “National Osceola Turkey Day”. **Page S1044**

Recognizing the Contributions of AmeriCorps: Senate agreed to S. Res. 136, recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States. **Page S1044**

Coast Guard Ombudsman Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 137, honoring the volunteers of the Coast Guard Ombudsman program on the Ombudsman Appreciation Day. **Page S1044**

Measures Considered:

Fire Grants and Safety Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 870, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs. **Pages S1016–17**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 78), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S1016–17**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, at approximately 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 30, 2023, and that all time be considered expired. **Page S1060**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–6) **Page S1046**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–7)

Pages S1046–47

Taylor-Kale Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, March 30, 2023, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Laura Taylor-Kale, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, and vote on confirmation thereon; and that upon disposition of the nomination, Senate resume Legislative Session. **Page S1060**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Matthew P. Brookman, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana. **Page S1044**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1047–49**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S1049–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1053–54**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1054–59**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1045–46**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1059**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1059–60**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1060**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—80) **Pages S1016–17, S1023–24, S1044**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:37 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 30, 2023. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1060.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Deb Haaland, Secretary of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony from Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security.

DEFENSE INFORMATION NETWORKS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded a hearing to examine enterprise cybersecurity to protect the Department of Defense Information Networks, after receiving testimony from John B. Sherman, Chief Information Officer, and Lieutenant General Robert J. Skinner, USAF, Director, Defense Information Systems Agency, both of the Department of Defense.

OIL DEPENDENCE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the cost of oil dependence in a low-carbon world, after receiving testimony from Claudio Galimberti, RystadEnergy, Houston, Texas; Gregor Semieniuk, University of Massachusetts, Amherst;

and Daniel Raimi, Resources for the Future, Benjamin Zycher, American Enterprise Institute, and Lucian Pugliese, Energy Policy Research Foundation, all of Washington, D.C.

NEXT GENERATION AVIATION TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advancing next generation aviation technologies, after receiving testimony from Kevin Welsh, Executive Director, Office of Environment and Energy, Federal Aviation Administration; Robert Pearce, Associate Administrator, Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Jon Gordon, Universal Hydrogen Co., Hawthorne, California; Val Miftakhov, Zeroavia, Everett, Washington; Arjan Hegeman, GE Aerospace, Cincinnati, Ohio; and Ben Lieberman, Competitive Enterprise Institute, and Marc Scribner, Reason Foundation, both of Washington, D.C.

EPA GOOD NEIGHBOR RULE

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency Good Neighbor Rule, focusing on healthier air for downwind states, after receiving testimony from Serena McIlwain, Maryland Secretary of the Environment, Baltimore; Karen Peters, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Director, Phoenix; Chris Wells, Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality Executive Director, Jackson; David G. Hill, American Lung Association, Middlebury, Connecticut; and Paul Noe, American Forest and Paper Association, Washington, D.C.

ORAL HEALTH CRISIS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Health Care concluded a hearing to examine the oral health crisis, focusing on identifying and addressing health disparities, after receiving testimony from Warren Brill, Eastpoint Dentistry, Baltimore, Maryland, on behalf of the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry; Jonathan P. Forte, RiverStone Health, Billings, Montana; Cherae Farmer-Dixon, Meharry Medical College School of Dentistry, Nashville, Tennessee; and Marko Vujicic, American Dental Association Health Policy Institute, Chicago, Illinois.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 670, to improve services for trafficking victims by establishing, in Homeland Security Investigations, the Investigators Maintain Purposeful Aware-

ness to Combat Trafficking Trauma Program and the Victim Assistance Program;

S. 264, to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain disclosures by registrants regarding exemptions under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 211, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish an enhanced use lease pilot program, with amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 709, to improve performance and accountability in the Federal Government, with an amendment;

S. 717, to improve plain writing and public experience;

S. 666, to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Chief Operating Officer of each agency to compile a list of unnecessary programs;

S. 824, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a national risk management cycle;

S. 884, to establish a Government-wide approach to improving digital identity;

S. 479, to modify the fire management assistance cost share, with an amendment;

S. 780, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order to prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives;

S. 108, to require a guidance clarity statement on certain agency guidance;

S. 111, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rulemaking, to include a link to a 100-word plain language summary of the proposed rule;

S. 349, to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the appointment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces who are on active duty, disabled, or deceased to positions in which the spouses will work remotely, with an amendment;

S. 243, to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to establish procedures for conducting maintenance projects at ports of entry at which the Office of Field Operations conducts certain enforcement and facilitation activities;

S. 310, to establish an advisory group to encourage and foster collaborative efforts among individuals and entities engaged in disaster recovery relating to debris removal;

S. 257, to prohibit contracting with persons that have business operations with the Maduro regime;

S. 206, to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry;

S. 679, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective;

S. 829, to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to clarify a provision relating to certain contents of registrations under that Act;

S. 794, to require a pilot program on the participation of non-asset-based third-party logistics providers in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism;

S. 917, to establish the duties of the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency regarding open source software security;

S. 945, to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, with an amendment;

S. 932, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses; and

S. 933, to amend the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to modify requirements relating to data centers of certain Federal agencies.

STARBUCKS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the need to end illegal union busting at Starbucks, after receiving testimony from former Representative Bradley Byrne; Howard Schultz, Starbucks Coffee Company, Seattle, Washington; Sharon Block, Harvard Law School Center for Labor and a Just Economy, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Rachel Greszler, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Maggie Carter, Knoxville, Tennessee; and Jaysin Saxton, Augusta, Georgia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 460, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to establish an urban Indian organi-

zation confer policy for the Department of Health and Human Services;

S. 306, to approve the settlement of the water right claims of the Tule River Tribe;

S. 595, to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna in the Rio San Jose Stream System and the Pueblos of Jemez and Zia in the Rio Jemez Stream System in the State of New Mexico; and

S. 950, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make a technical correction to the water rights settlement for the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, with an amendment.

TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT OVERSIGHT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the future of tribal energy development, focusing on implementation of the Inflation Reduction Act and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Hogan, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Energy and Acting Under Secretary for Infrastructure; and Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL VETTING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine personnel vetting modernization, after receiving testimony from Jason S. Miller, Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; Kiran A. Ahuja, Director, Office of Personnel Management; Stacey A. Dixon, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence; and Ronald Moultrie, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 555 public bills, H.R. 1844–2398; 1 private bill, H.R. 2399; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 264–265, were introduced. **Pages H1622–41**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1660**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Spartz to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1531**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:22 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H1539**

Lower Energy Costs Act: The House considered H.R. 1, to lower energy costs by increasing American energy production, exports, infrastructure, and critical minerals processing, by promoting transparency, accountability, permitting, and production

of American resources, and by improving water quality certification and energy projects. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, March 30th.

Pages H1542–H1615

Agreed to:

Donalds amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires a study on streamlining the regulatory approval timeline by examining certain licensing/permitting processes for other sources of energy under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy;

Page H1584

Crenshaw amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that amends the Safe Drinking Water Act to clarify the requisite timeline for making a decision on the approval or disapproval of a State underground injection control program;

Pages H1585–86

Estes amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires the Secretary of Energy to use an index-based pricing bid system when purchasing petroleum products for the SPR;

Pages H1586–87

Houlahan amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that prohibits export or sale of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to China, North Korea, Russia, Iran or any country subject to sanctions imposed by the United States;

Pages H1588–89

Mace amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires the Secretary of Energy to report annually on the ongoing assessments of critical energy resources and actions taken to strengthen supply chains to advance American energy security;

Page H1590

Roy amendment (No. 13 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that directs FERC to withdraw its policy statements titled “Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Facilities” and “Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Natural Gas Infrastructure Project Reviews”;

Pages H1595–96

Barr amendment (No. 15 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that amends the FAST Act to expand eligibility for FAST 41 permitting for projects related to the extraction, recovery, or processing of critical minerals, rare-earth elements, microfine carbon, or carbon from coal, coal waste, coal processing waste, pre- or post-combustion coal byproducts, or acid mine drainage from coal mines;

Pages H1596–97

Boebert amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that adds a Sense of Congress expressing disapproval of the denial of Jordan Cove Project permits (by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 167);

Pages H1584–85, H1597

Hern amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that expresses the sense of Congress disapproving of the proposed tax hikes on the oil

and natural gas industry in the President’s fiscal year 2024 budget request (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 206 noes, Roll No. 168);

Pages H1587–88, H1597–98

Jackson (TX) amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires the EPA, in consultation with the DOE, to submit a report to Congress identifying and assessing existing regulations that have negatively affected domestic energy independence and increased energy cost for Americans (by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 169);

Pages H1589–90, H1598–99

Molinaro amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires a GAO study on how banning natural gas appliances will affect the rates and charges for electricity (by a recorded vote of 268 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 170);

Pages H1590–91, H1599

Palmer amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that prohibits the Secretary of Energy from implementing its proposed rule regarding gas stoves, or any other rule that would limit consumer access to gas stoves (by a recorded vote of 251 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 171);

Pages H1591–92, H1599–H1600

Boebert amendment (No. 16 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that shortens the timetable to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval of a major infrastructure project, such as a highway or public transit project, from 150 days to 90 days;

Pages H1602–03

Crawford amendment (No. 17 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires DOT to apply the One Federal Decision procedures to pipeline projects under NEPA review to streamline the environmental review/permitting process;

Pages H1603–04

Donalds amendment (No. 18 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires a report on the current status of American uranium, how America’s uranium compares to the global supply of uranium in terms of quantity and quality, etc.;

Pages H1604–05

Perez amendment (No. 21 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires the Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Department of Commerce to determine technological needs for permitting programs and report them to Congress annually;

Pages H1606–07

Westerman amendment (No. 22 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that creates a national strategy for America to re-shore mineral supply chains and challenge the CCP;

Pages H1607–08

LaMalfa amendment (No. 23 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that allows wildfire mitigation activities within 300 feet of a road on Federal lands to be carried out without regard to NEPA or ESA requirements;

Pages H1608–09

LaMalfa amendment (No. 24 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that expands the definition of “hazard trees” identified and removed along electric power lines as part of a utility’s vegetation management plan to trees within 50 feet, from 10 feet; such plans will also be automatically approved after 60 days; **Pages H1609–10**

Luna amendment (No. 28 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that requires GAO to publish a report on the impact of wind energy, including the adverse effects of wind energy on military readiness, marine environment, and tourism, before the Secretary of the Interior can publish or hold a lease sale for energy development in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area, the South Atlantic Planning Area, or the Straits of Florida Planning Area; and **Pages H1613–14**

Luna amendment (No. 29 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that expresses the sense of Congress that major components of wind infrastructure, including turbines, are imported in large quantities from other countries including countries that are national security threats, such as the Government of the People’s Republic of China. **Pages H1614–15**

Rejected:

Perry amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that sought to prohibit the Delaware River Basin Commission, Susquehanna River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing any regulations relating to hydraulic fracturing other than those issued by the State in which the regulation is to be implemented or enforced (by a recorded vote of 210 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 172); **Pages H1592–93, H1600–01**

Perry amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that sought to repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act (by a recorded vote of 96 ayes to 336 noes, Roll No. 173); **Pages H1593–95, H1601**

Grijalva amendment (No. 19 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that sought to strike Section 20103, which requires the Secretary of Interior to resolve any protest to a lease sale within 60 days; and **Page H1605**

Levin amendment (No. 27 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that sought to specify that Division B shall not take effect until the Council on Environmental Quality, in consultation with affected Federal agencies, certifies that all agencies have the funding and staffing capacity to meet the Division’s new timelines for environmental review without reducing the quality of such review. **Pages H1612–13**

Proceedings Postponed:

Westerman amendment (No. 20 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that seeks to prohibit the Communist Party of China (or a person acting on behalf

of the Communist Party of China) from acquiring any interest with respect to American farmland or any lands used for American renewable energy production; **Pages H1605–06**

Leger Fernandez amendment (No. 25 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that seeks to require each local unit of the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and Forest Service to develop a plan to disseminate and advertise open civil service positions with functions relating to permitting and natural resources in their offices; each plan shall include outreach to local high schools, community colleges, institutions of higher education, and any other relevant institutions; and **Pages H1610–11**

Levin amendment (No. 26 printed in part B of H. Rept. 118–30) that seeks to strike Title V of Division B, to prevent the bill from repealing the Inflation Reduction Act’s reforms to the oil and gas leasing program. **Pages H1611–12**

H. Res. 260, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) was agreed to yesterday, March 28th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 30th. **Page H1615**

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared on April 3, 2014 is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2023—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 118–19). **Page H1615**

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared on April 1, 2015 is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2023—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 118–20). **Pages H1615–16**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1597, H1597–98, H1598–99, H1599, H1600, H1600–01, and H1601.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Justice. Testimony was heard from Merrick Garland, Attorney General, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. NAVY AND U.S. MARINE CORPS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps. Testimony was heard from Carlos Del Toro, Secretary, Department of the Navy; Admiral Michael M. Gilday, Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; and General David H. Berger, Commandant, Department of the Marine Corps.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the Department of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from Alejandro Mayorkas, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES OF RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Addressing the Challenges of Rural America”. Testimony was heard from Lenita Jacobs-Simmons, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor; Ruth Ryder, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education; Tom Morris, Associate Administrator for Rural Health Policy, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Laura Scheibe, Director for Career and Technical Education, South Dakota Department of Education; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from Dennis McDonough, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of the Treasury International Programs. Testimony was heard from Janet Yellen, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Testimony was heard from Michael L. Connor, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works); Lieutenant General Scott A. Spellmon, Chief of Engineers and Commanding General, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and Camille Calimlim Touton, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Department of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the U.S. Capitol Police. Testimony was heard from J. Thomas Manger, Chief of Police, U.S. Capitol Police.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Food and Drug Administration. Testimony was heard from Robert M. Califf, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Park Service. Testimony was heard from the following Department of the Interior officials: Tracy Stone-Manning, Director, Bureau of Land Management; Martha Williams, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and Charles F. Sams III, Director, National Park Service.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Testimony was heard from Gary Gensler, Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission.

FISCAL YEAR 2024 DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2024 Defense Budget

Request”. Testimony was heard from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; and General Mark A. Milley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL CHIEFS: PERSONNEL POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Military Department Personnel Chiefs: Personnel Posture”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Douglas F. Stitt, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, U.S. Army; Vice Admiral Richard Cheeseman, Jr., Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Personnel, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Caroline Miller, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Personnel, U.S. Air Force; Lieutenant General James Glynn, Deputy Commandant, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, U.S. Marine Corps; and Katharine Kelley, Senior Executive Service, Deputy Chief of Space Operations for Human Capital, U.S. Space Force.

FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FIXED-WING TACTICAL AND TRAINING AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request of the Department of Defense for Fixed-Wing Tactical and Training Aircraft Programs”. Testimony was heard from Andrew P. Hunter, Senior Executive Service, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; Lieutenant General Richard G. Moore, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs (HAF/A8), U.S. Air Force; Frederick Stefany, Senior Executive Service, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition (Acting), and Senior Acquisition Executive for the F-35 Program (SAE/F-35); Rear Admiral Andrew Loiselle, Director, Air Warfare Division (OPNAV/N98), U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Michael S. Cederholm, Deputy Commandant for Aviation, U.S. Marine Corps; Lieutenant General Michael J. Schmidt, F-35 Program Executive Officer (JPO), U.S. Air Force; and Jon Ludwigson, USG Civilian, Director, Contracting and National Security Acquisitions, Government Accountability Office.

FISCAL STATE OF THE UNION

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal State of the Union”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DIVERSITY OF THOUGHT: PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development held a hearing entitled “Diversity of Thought: Protecting Free Speech on College Campuses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FISCAL YEAR 2024 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2024 Department of Health and Human Services Budget”. Testimony was heard from Xavier Becerra, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

TAKING THE BUZZER BEATER TO THE BANK: PROTECTING COLLEGE ATHLETES’ NIL DEALMAKING RIGHTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce held a hearing entitled “Taking the Buzzer Beater to the Bank: Protecting College Athletes’ NIL Dealmaking Rights”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FOLLOW THE MONEY: OVERSIGHT OF PRESIDENT BIDEN’S MASSIVE SPENDING SPREE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Follow the Money: Oversight of President Biden’s Massive Spending Spree”. Testimony was heard from Teri L. Donaldson, Inspector General, Department of Energy; Mark Gaffigan, Managing Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Peggy E. Gustafson, Inspector General, Department of Commerce; and Sean O’Donnell, Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

THE FEDERAL REGULATORS’ RESPONSE TO RECENT BANK FAILURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Federal Regulators’ Response to Recent Bank Failures”. Testimony was heard from Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Michael S. Barr, Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve; and Nellie Liang, Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, Department of Treasury.

OVERSIGHT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF UKRAINE ASSISTANCE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight, Transparency, and Accountability of Ukraine Assistance”. Testimony was

heard from Nicole L. Angarella, Acting Deputy Inspector General, performing the duties of the Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development; Diana R. Shaw, Deputy Inspector General performing the duties of the Inspector General, Department of State; and Robert P. Storch, Inspector General, Department of Defense.

EXAMINING U.S. SANCTIONS POLICY, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Examining U.S. Sanctions Policy, Implementation, and Enforcement”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEARING ON COMPLIANCE WITH COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Responsiveness and Accountability to Oversight held a hearing entitled “Hearing on Compliance with Committee Oversight”. Testimony was heard from Christopher Dunham, Acting Assistant Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Gwen Graham, Assistant Secretary, Department of Education; and Jeanne Bumpus, Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Trade Commission.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVING HEALTHCARE DELIVERY IN TRIBAL COMMUNITIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled “Challenges and Opportunities for Improving Healthcare Delivery in Tribal Communities”. Testimony was heard from Roselyn Tso, Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

OVERDUE OVERSIGHT OF THE CAPITAL CITY: PART I

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Overdue Oversight of the Capital City: Part I”. Testimony was heard from Charles Allen, Councilmember, Council of the District of Columbia; Glen Lee, Chief Financial Officer, Washington D.C.; Phil Mendelson, Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia; and a public witness.

LOGIN.GOV DOESN'T MEET THE STANDARD

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Government Operations and the Federal Workforce held a hearing entitled “Login.gov Doesn't Meet the Standard”. Testimony was heard from Carol Fortine Ochoa, Inspector General, Gen-

eral Services Administration; Sonny Hashmi, Commissioner, Federal Acquisition Service, General Services Administration; and Jim St. Pierre, Acting Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Full Committee held a markup on H.J. Res. 42, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. H.J. Res. 42 was ordered reported, without amendment.

FUELING UNAFFORDABILITY: HOW THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES CATALYZED GLOBAL ENERGY SCARCITY AND COMPOUNDED INFLATION

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Energy Policy, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing entitled “Fueling Unaffordability: How the Biden Administration's Policies Catalyzed Global Energy Scarcity and Compounded Inflation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 676, the “Coastal Communities Ocean Acidification Act of 2023”; H.R. 1482, the “NOAA Weather Radio Modernization Act of 2023”; H.R. 1496, the “National Weather Service Communications Improvement Act”; H.R. 1713, the “DOE and USDA Interagency Research Act”; H.R. 1715, the “Advanced Weather Model Computing Development Act”; H.R. 1734, the “TRANQ Research Act”; and H.R. 1735, the “Mathematical and Statistical Modeling Education Act”. H.R. 676, H.R. 1482, H.R. 1496, and H.R. 1715 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1713, H.R. 1734, and H.R. 1735 were ordered reported, as amended.

HIGHLIGHTING THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESSES IN DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Rural Development, Energy, and Supply Chains held a hearing entitled “Highlighting the Role of Small Businesses in Domestic Energy Production”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 234, the “Gerald's Law Act”; H.R. 854, the “Captain James C. Edge Gold Star Spouse

Equity Act”; H.R. 984, the “Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act”; H.R. 1139, the “GUARD VA Benefits Act”; H.R. 1329, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the maximum number of judges who may be appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims; H.R. 1378, the “Veterans’ Appeals Backlog Improvement Act”; H.R. 1529, the “Veterans’ Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2023”; and H.R. 1530, the “Veterans Benefits Improvement Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bergman, Ciscomani, Levin, Luttrell, Pappas, and Self; Kevin J. Friel, Deputy Director of the Pension and Fiduciary Service, Department of Veterans Affairs; Cheryl Rawls, Executive Director, Department of Veterans Affairs; Christa A. Shriber, Deputy Chief Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 41, the “VA Same-Day Scheduling Act of 2023”; H.R. 562, the “Improving Veterans Access to Congressional Services Act of 2023”; H.R. 808, the “Veterans Patient Advocacy Act”; H.R. 754, the “Modernizing Veterans’ Health Care Eligibility Act”; H.R. 693, the “Veterans Affairs Medical Center Absence and Notification Timeline Act”; H.R. 1089, the “VA Medical Center Facility Transparency Act”; H.R. 366, the “Korean American VALOR Act”; H.R. 542, the “Elizabeth Dole Home-and Community-Based Services for Veterans and Caregivers Act of 2023”; and H.R. 1256, the “Veterans Health Administration Leadership Transformation Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Baird, Lesko, Mast, Moolenaar, and Womack; Scotte R. Hartronft, Executive Director, Department of Veterans Affairs; Alfred A. Montoya, Jr., Deputy Assistant Under Secretary for Health Operations, Department of Veterans Affairs; David Perry, Chief Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

WELFARE IS BROKEN: RESTORING WORK REQUIREMENTS TO LIFT AMERICANS OUT OF POVERTY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Work and Welfare held a hearing entitled “Welfare is Broken: Restoring Work Requirements to Lift Americans Out of Poverty”. Testimony was heard from Shakirah Francis, Employment Services Social Work Supervisor, Department of Social Services Employment Services Division, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; and public witnesses.

BUDGET HEARING ON THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE AND THE NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture held a hearing entitled “Budget hearing on the National Reconnaissance Office and the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency”. Testimony was heard from Chris Scolese, Director, National Reconnaissance Office, Department of Defense; and Vice Admiral Frank Whitworth, Director, National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Conservation, Climate, Forestry, and Natural Resources, to hold hearings to examine forestry in the Farm Bill, focusing on the importance of America’s forests, 10:30 a.m., SR-328A.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2024 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC-217, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight, to hold hearings to examine petrochemicals to waste, focusing on the lifecycle, environmental, and climate effects of plastic, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine pharmacy benefit managers and the prescription drug supply chain, focusing on the impact on patients and taxpayers, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Nicole D. Theriot, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, Ann Marie Yastishock, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Independent State of Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, Robin Dunnigan, of California, to be Ambassador to Georgia, and David J. Kostelancik, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, all of the Department of State, and other pending nominations, 10:15 a.m., SD-419.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine guardianship and alternatives, focusing on protection and empowerment, 10 a.m., SD-106.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Agriculture, 9 a.m., 2362—A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2358—A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation, hearing entitled “Cyberspace Operations: Conflict in the 21st Century”, 8:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Reauthorization of the Animal Drug User Fee Programs”, 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government, hearing entitled “Hearing on the Weaponization of the Federal Government”, 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “FAA Reauthorization: Harnessing the Evolution of Flight to Deliver for the American People”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing on H.R. 291, the “Vaccine Discharge Parity Act”; H.R. 645, the “Healthy Foundations for Homeless Veterans Act”; H.R. 728, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program on short-term programs for veterans; H.R. 746, the “Streamlining Aviation for Eligible Veterans Act”; H.R. 1169, the “VA E-Notification Enhancement Act”; legislation on the Protect Military Dependents Act; legislation on the Filipino Education Fairness Act; legislation on the Get Rewarding Outdoor Work for our Veterans Act; legislation on the Ensure Military Personnel Learn Opportunities Yielding Vocations that Employ Transitioning Servicemembers Act; legislation on the VE-TEC Authorization Act of 2023; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that educational assistance paid under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs to an individual who pursued a program or course of education that was suspended or terminated by reason of a determination of fraud shall not be charged against the entitlement of the individual, and for other purposes, 9:30 a.m., 390 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Budget hearing on the Office of the Director of National Intelligence”, 8:30 a.m., HVC-304 Hearing Room. This hearing is closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 30

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 870, Fire Grants and Safety Act. Senate is then expected to adopt the motion to proceed by voice vote.

At 1:45 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Laura Taylor-Kale, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, with a vote on confirmation thereon.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1—Lower Energy Costs Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Cammack, Kat, Fla., E277
Cicilline, David N., R.I., E275
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E274
Finstad, Brad, Minn., E275
Garamendi, John, Calif., E273, E275
Hoyle, Val T., Ore., E279

Huffman, Jared, Calif., E274
Jackson, Jonathan L., Ill., E278
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E279, E279
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E276
Moskowitz, Jared, Fla., E278
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E273
Rosendale, Matthew M., Sr., Mont., E273, E274, E277, E278

Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E275
Smith, Adam, Wash., E277
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E277
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E277
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E276
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E274, E278



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are